

VOLUME XXIII

NUMBER 3

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING ADDRESSES

ORGANIZATION AND CONDUCT OF LOCAL CHAPTERS

PLACE AND FUNCTION OF FACULTIES

REVIEWS

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

MARCH · 1937

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1937

PRESIDENT

A. J. CARLSON¹ (*Physiology*) University of Chicago

VICE-PRESIDENTS

LOUISE POUND (*English*)
S. H. SLICHTER (*Economics*)

GENERAL SECRETARY

R. E. HIMSTEAD (*Law*) Washington Office

TREASURER²

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

For term ending December 31, 1937

JOHN W. BRADSHAW ¹ (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Michigan
D. W. CORNELIUS (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Chattanooga
R. L. DEWEY (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Michigan
A. R. GIFFORD (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Vermont
W. B. GRAVES (<i>Political Science</i>)	Temple University
R. E. HIMSTEAD (<i>Law</i>)	Washington Office
FLORENCE P. LEWIS ¹ (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Goucher College
J. L. MERIAM (<i>Education</i>)	University of California (L. A.)
K. H. PORTER (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Iowa
MARGARET F. WASHBURN (<i>Psychology</i>)	Vassar College

For term ending December 31, 1938

JOSEPH ALLEN ¹ (<i>Mathematics</i>)	City College (New York)
R. S. AUSTIN (<i>Pathology</i>)	University of Cincinnati
M. H. BISSELL (<i>Geography</i>)	University of Southern California
E. C. KIRKLAND (<i>History</i>)	Bowdoin College
A. C. KREY (<i>History</i>)	University of Minnesota
B. W. KUNKEL (<i>Biology</i>)	Lafayette College
J. H. KUSNER (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Florida
W. H. MICHENER (<i>Physics</i>)	Carnegie Institute of Technology
FERNANDUS PAYNE ¹ (<i>Zoology</i>)	Indiana University
LAURA A. WHITE (<i>History</i>)	University of Wyoming

For term ending December 31, 1939

WILLIAM R. ARTHUR (<i>Law</i>)	University of Colorado
J. B. BULLITT (<i>Pathology</i>)	University of North Carolina
L. A. DOGGETT (<i>Electrical Engineering</i>)	Pennsylvania State College
D. G. FOSTER (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Swarthmore College
A. N. HOLCOMBE (<i>Government</i>)	Harvard University
SIDNEY HOOK (<i>Philosophy</i>)	New York University
MARK H. INGRAHAM (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Wisconsin
ROBERT E. MATHEWS (<i>Law</i>)	Ohio State University
DR SCOTT (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Missouri
S. STEPHENSON SMITH (<i>English</i>)	University of Oregon

Ex-officio

W. B. MUNRO (<i>Government</i>)	California Institute of Technology
W. W. COOK (<i>Law</i>)	Northwestern University
S. A. MITCHELL (<i>Astronomy</i>)	University of Virginia

¹ Members of the Executive Committee.

¹ Correspondence should be sent to the Washington Office only.

BULLETIN
OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING ADDRESSES

ORGANIZATION AND CONDUCT OF LOCAL CHAPTERS

PLACE AND FUNCTION OF FACULTIES

REVIEWS

Editor: H. W. TYLER

Editorial Committee:

JOSEPH ALLEN

R. E. HIMSTEAD

PAUL KAUFMAN

Publication Office:

20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

Editorial Office:

744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTE.....	182
ANNUAL MEETING ADDRESSES	
Freedom, Peace, and the Teacher, <i>S. P. Duggan</i>	183
Privileges and Immunities, <i>S. P. Capen</i>	190
Comments on Dr. Capen's Address, <i>H. W. Tyler</i>	202
NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS	
Notes from the Washington Office.....	207
Association of American Colleges.....	208
Association of Urban Universities.....	210
General Education Board, Annual Report.....	210
National Research Council, Fellowships.....	211
Institute of International Education.....	211
Julius Rosenwald Fund.....	211
International Scientific Congresses.....	212
Representation at the University of Athens.....	212
COMMITTEE REPORTS AND NOTES	
Organization and Conduct of Local Chapters, Report of Committee E.....	213
The Place and Function of Faculties in University Organization, Report of Committee T.....	220
Teachers' Loyalty Oaths, <i>Alexander Guerry</i>	229
The American Legion and the Schools.....	234
REVIEWS	
Higher Education and Society: A Symposium.....	235
The Higher Learning in America, <i>R. M. Hutchins</i>	237
Newer Aspects of Collegiate Education, <i>Kathryn McHale and Frances V. Speek</i>	239
The Campus and Social Ideals, <i>H. S. Tuttle</i>	240
Scholarships and Fellowships at Higher Institutions, <i>Ella B. Ratcliffe</i>	241
Index to Vocations, compiled by <i>Willodeen Price and Zelma E. Ticen</i>	241
NOTES FROM PERIODICALS.....	243

TABLE OF CONTENTS

181

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

April Regional Meeting, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.....	247
Chapter Activities.....	247
DePauw University, Restoration to Eligible List.....	249
Oberlin College, Report of President.....	250
Swarthmore College, Report of President.....	251
Temple University, Faculty-Student Committee.....	252
Yale University, Report of President.....	253

MEMBERSHIP

Members Elected.....	255
Nominations for Membership.....	257

ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE..... 262

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* may be found by consulting the **EDUCATION INDEX**.

EDITORIAL NOTE

In this issue of the *Bulletin* the publication of material from the Annual Meeting is continued. Editorial comment on the important address by Chancellor Capen is presented separately. The present report of Committee T is devoted to the difficult problems of departmental organization and administration. Certain additional material relating to the report is reserved for later publication. This *Bulletin*, as is customary in March, aims to include announcements of principal international meetings during the summer.

The report of Committee E, together with the Local and Chapter Notes of later pages, reflects a gratifying amount of activity.

The important report of the special committee appointed to investigate the case of Professor Jerome Davis at Yale University has been received but not in time for publication in this issue. In accordance with the usual practice of the Association it has been referred to President Angell and Professor Davis for correction of possible factual errors; and also to the officers of the Association and the members of Committee A for their consideration. A report on Park College is in preparation.

ANNUAL MEETING ADDRESSES

FREEDOM, PEACE, AND THE TEACHER¹

I

Informed men and women are not unaware of the nature and accomplishments of the totalitarian regimes in the contemporary totalitarian states. But the subject of this address requires that these be considered only in so far as they bear upon Freedom, Peace, and the Teacher. Centering attention first upon the concept of freedom, these totalitarian states may be briefly described as follows:

1. *Political Structure.*—The Fascist totalitarian state is an autocracy. There is no real representation of the people as such in the government, nor is the government conducted according to Constitutional provisions. The Constitution grows and is transformed as need arises. The state is rigidly unitary, all power emanating from the capital. Germany has abolished the federal system. As there is no Constitution, there is no Bill of Rights protecting the individual. There can be none for in the totalitarian state the individual has no rights as against the state.

The Communist totalitarian state (Russia) has recently been granted a Constitution by the ruling oligarchy. It remains to be seen whether the government will be administered according to the Constitution. The Soviet Union is not a unitary state but a federation of "republics." Nevertheless, this federated organization does not prevent absolute control of the whole Union by the central government.

The political structure of the totalitarian state has enabled it to secure a greater degree of unity, stability, and power than it enjoyed since the World War but it has no greater prestige and dignity than are enjoyed by democratic states like Great Britain and the United States.

2. *Economic Structure.*—In the Fascist totalitarian state the government controls the destinies of capital and labor. The government may at any time interfere in the conduct of a branch of industry and dictate to the capitalist what he must do with his private property. The labor unions have been abolished and labor is even more at the mercy of the government than is capital. From the most reliable information available it appears that in Fascist states there has been a steady deterioration in the economic structure and a fall in the standard of living. In the Soviet Union private property in capital does not exist and the state is the sole employer. Labor unions flourish but it is difficult to say how much influence they really exert in protecting the interests of the workers. The prevailing standard of living is very low, but it was even lower for the great mass of people before the advent of the Marxian totalitarian state.

¹ Address delivered at the annual dinner, December 28, 1936.

3. *Social Structure.*—Freedom has been destroyed in the totalitarian state, Fascist, and Communist alike,—freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly. Nor is there freedom of teaching or of learning,—school and university existing primarily to inculcate the ideology of totalitarianism. The aim is complete regimentation of the people. To that end espionage is a pronounced feature in social life and no man dare call his soul his own. In the Fascist states practically all the old social distinctions remain. In Communist Russia where they were abolished and equalitarianism introduced, social distinctions are slowly returning.

4. *International Relations.*—In international relations the Fascist states have resorted to threat, blackmail, and hold-up. As a result the world is kept in a constant state of fear of war and all states are driven to keep fully armed. Treaty commitments are not honored. The young are taught that war is a noble human activity, and democracy as a way of life is derided.

Communist Russia undoubtedly desires peace at the present time in order to achieve her domestic, economic, and social principles. War would either prevent or delay this realization. Her foreign policy is therefore dictated by the desire for peace and for collective security. Nevertheless, as realists, the Soviet leaders have developed one of the largest and strongest fighting forces in the world. At least for the time being it will probably be used for purely defensive purposes.

II

Assuming that this brief description of the totalitarian state is fairly accurate, the first important conclusion to emerge is that all totalitarian states are menaces to freedom. But a second conclusion also suggests itself: namely, that the Fascist totalitarian states are at the present time also enemies of peace. The Communist totalitarian state despite its present advocacy of peace, as evidenced by its propaganda abroad up to the introduction of the first Five Year Plan in 1928, may be expected to adopt an anti-peace policy whenever it feels called upon to spread this gospel of the collective state.

There remain the states that, generally speaking, prefer freedom at home and peace abroad as a way of life, namely, the democracies.

Confronted with an international situation such as that described above, can a democracy today realize such a way of life? Only if it is willing to fight for it. Otherwise it will be constantly intimidated into submission to the demands of the totalitarian Powers. But the peoples of the democratic countries are by force of present circumstances strong opponents of war and only with difficulty are they induced to accept an enormous armament program in time of peace and conscription in

time of war. Yet that is the only way today to maintain domestic freedom,—for the loss of freedom at home is an almost certain corollary to submission to the will of the totalitarian states. How this determination to maintain freedom is to be realized in actual practice depends upon a great variety of circumstances—geographic, economic, political, and even racial.

In the history of the United States devotion to freedom at home and peace abroad is generally speaking traditional, a part of our national heritage. Yet we have sometimes had to choose between these two great principles. We secured our freedom in the Revolution by violating the principle of peace. We maintained national unity in 1861 as the result of war and incidentally brought freedom to several millions of our inhabitants. Obviously, while devoted to peace, as a principle we feel we must be prepared to wage war. Today Fascism boasts of a remarkable expansion. We think of Germany and Italy when discussing Fascism, but we must not forget that Poland, Portugal, Austria, and Hungary are semi-Fascist states; that Spain is our nearest European neighbor; that Mexico is a semi-Communist state, that almost the whole of the remainder of Latin America is controlled by dictators or oligarchies and that Japan is thoroughly militarized. In recent years the area of Democracy has steadily receded and with it the area of freedom. Does this have any portent for the United States? What are the circumstances that will determine our attitude?

I believe that the United States has renounced imperialistic ambitions. These ambitions were once concentrated in the Caribbean area and our marines have been entirely withdrawn from that area. Moreover, in accordance with his Good Neighbor Policy, President Roosevelt at the Woodrow Wilson Foundation banquet, December 28, 1933, urged that the heads of governments join in a simple declaration "that no nation will permit any of its armed forces to cross its own borders into the territory of another nation. Such an act would be regarded by humanity as an act of aggression." And at the Buenos Aires Conference the United States Delegation cast its vote for a virtual ban on the use of our marines in all Latin-American countries. In view of our new ideal and recent international practice it is fair to say that not only are the people of the United States strongly opposed to war but that they regard its armed forces as intended for defense only.

Americans can not be too grateful for the geographic position of the United States, separated from Europe by the wide Atlantic and from Asia by the wider Pacific, with 3000 miles of undefended frontier between ourselves and a friendly nation on the north and with a weak nation on the south. No other great power in the world is so safeguarded by nature from enemies. Upon no other great power, therefore, is laid

such a heavy burden of proof that any conflict in which we may engage is really and indisputably a war of defense and that the preparation for any conflict is a form of defense.

Do the facts concerning our armed forces conform to this conclusion? On the claim chiefly that we have three long coast lines and the Panama Canal to defend we have built up the largest and probably the strongest navy in the world. Nevertheless, the people of the United States are not much alarmed at the growth of the navy. It is regarded as primarily for the defense of the home territory. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that even in the World War German submarines were able to cross the Atlantic and return and that since then the submarine has been greatly increased in size, power, and cruising radius. Finally, throughout history no navy has ever overthrown freedom and established autocracy.

These observations are not necessarily true of the army. It is primarily a weapon of offensive war and it has nearly always been the instrument used for the overthrow of freedom. It is that fact that causes concern among thoughtful people about the great increase made during the depression in the size of our army. No one believes that any nation, however powerful, would attempt to invade the United States. Moreover, if it did, greater reliance would probably be placed upon mechanized methods of warfare than upon army man-power. Labor men are not without some justification for their fear that the army might be used to suppress strikes. It is generally held now that Mr. Cleveland made a mistake in using United States troops to quell the Pullman strike on the plea that it prevented the transportation of the mails. But labor men fear that despite the lapse of time the precedent might be imitated.

Now what is the connection between the ideology of the totalitarian states concerning freedom and peace on the one hand and these comments on the army and navy of the United States on the other? I believe there is a very important connection. The pusillanimity that characterizes the foreign policy of Great Britain at the present time, swallowing insults and even threats from the Fascist states is not edifying to the inhabitants of democracies—and it is solely due to the fact that Great Britain does not feel sufficiently prepared to defend herself. Now only a scaremonger would suggest that the United States was in any danger from the totalitarian states. But that is not because those states have overlooked the United States in their constant and continuous propaganda. The activity of Italian Fascist propagandists among our Italian citizens was having real influence until Mr. Marcus Duffield in *Harper's Magazine* for November, 1929, roused us to the possible evil consequences and led to its being stopped. Similarly, Hitler was hardly in power before New York City was in an uproar at

the extent and barefacedness of the Nazi propaganda. Because of its crude character it was stopped with comparative ease. But in both cases it has not been without effect. Nor has Communistic propaganda been ineffectual, especially in our larger cities.

Let us consider for a moment the likelihood of the infiltration of totalitarian ideas elsewhere in the western hemisphere. One-third of Argentina's population is of Italian origin. Argentina is a semi-Fascist state and there is a great deal of Fascist propaganda taking root just now. Brazil is also a semi-Fascist state and one of its southern states, Rio Grande do Sol, inhabited by a large proportion of people of German origin, is also now subject to a great deal of Nazi propaganda. The splendid policy of the Good Neighbor, the Conference at Buenos Aires, and the personal visit of President Roosevelt to the Conference have formed an admirable antidote to the constant insidious anti-American propaganda that has been carried on by Europeans for years throughout Latin America before the adoption of the Good Neighbor Policy. But we must not allow the enthusiasm of the moment to blind us to the realities of the situation. The almost ingrained cynicism of Latin Americans regarding the United States will not lack for stimulus in the future as in the past, and it may well be a stimulus more acceptable to the governing classes.

But a danger for which we must really be prepared is a possible war in Europe in the near future. If it is a major war it is almost inevitable that we shall be dragged in. We shall certainly want to stay out but it will be difficult to stay out. Every combatant will draw up his own list of contraband and it will soon be found, as in the last year of the World War, that there is practically nothing of importance that is not contraband. It is true that one trades in contraband goods at one's own risk, but how long would our government be able to withstand the demand for protection from interested groups. Sixty per cent of our cotton is sold to foreign countries. For years now the cotton farmers have produced at a loss or with very small profits. Will they be willing to forego the chance to make extensive sales at large profits? Or will the wheat farmer who received \$3.00 a bushel for his wheat during the World War as against \$1.00 today be able to withstand the temptation to sell food to either side or both sides? Would the millions of unemployed who have suffered so distressfully for years be willing to forego the opportunity for employment in the manufacture of contraband which would probably mean among other things the manufacture of such ordinary goods as clothing, shoes, and medical supplies? Moreover, in the confusion that exists not only in the mind of the ordinary citizen but also in the mind of the scholar and statesman as to the meaning and place of neutrality, are we likely to follow a consistent policy?

III

Where does the teacher enter into this discussion? Every nation to-day regardless of its form of government or its philosophy of life looks upon education as its most important function and the teacher as engaged in life's most important vocation. What is education? Emphatically and essentially it is the search for and the diffusion of truth. However difficult it may be to answer the question, "What is truth?" there is one thing that can not be controverted. Truth will never be forthcoming when it is not honestly desired and sought, when facts are made to fit pre-determined views. There has been a good deal of discussion recently about the possibility of being really objective. Objectivity is defined by the aim of the writer or speaker. If you are doing your very best to find the truth and give it to the students then you are teaching objectively. The facts matter less than your attitude towards them.

If these statements have truth in them how absolutely unjust to the students of the totalitarian states is the education they are receiving. They are not only taught dogmatically the one point of view but even the facts in substantiation of other points of view are carefully concealed or are derided. Moreover, to question is to be unpatriotic. There are now such things as Russian economics, German sociology, and Italian ethics. The students in the universities of the totalitarian states are being prepared to live in an unreal world and sooner or later will receive a rude awakening.

If such treatment is unjust to the student of the totalitarian state, the treatment of the teacher is absolutely cruel. If he sincerely accepts the official teaching, no fault is to be found with him. But if he does not and continues to teach he must suffer the spiritual torture that an outraged conscience will surely provide. If he objects, expulsion is the mildest punishment; the prison doors may yawn open for him. And even expulsion today usually means starvation. An attempt to earn a living by the pen is impossible, for no publisher is permitted to print views in conflict with the official doctrines in any particular field. The descent towards such degradation for the teacher is sometimes slow and insidious. It may begin with a mild method of control such as a special oath for teachers. But if that is not resisted, and successfully resisted, the end of the movement will be the destruction of all liberty on the part of the teacher to think and to speak his own ideas. His work will consist in the regimentation of the minds of a whole nation. The result of that process is the decay of the intellectual life. What has any totalitarian state contributed to the intellectual life of the world?

When a problem becomes a world problem it needs a world solution and that has seldom been forthcoming. There may be some hope of a reasonable solution of an international problem that concerns two states; the difficulty is infinitely increased when it concerns all the states. Can the two main political systems, democracy and autocracy, exist side by side in a world that is narrowing daily, or is the one destined to destroy the other? Not twenty years have passed since the Bolsheviki forcibly seized power and established the proletarian dictatorship in the largest and most populous country of Europe. Since then two of the culturally most advanced nations, Italy and Germany, have become dictatorships of the Right and several smaller nations thinly disguised dictatorships. Is democracy to yield without a struggle? Are we to accept a defeatist attitude despite our awareness that the success of totalitarianism means the gradual decay of most of the fine things of life? How can creative work in the arts, sciences, and literature be stimulated by a regimented and distorted education? Now is the time, when we are thoroughly aware of the danger, to rally our forces in defense of the gains made during the past five centuries. The Renaissance, the Reformation, and the French Revolution were movements to liberate the human spirit. Surely *we* are not yet ready to accept a philosophy which will shackle it. In any event let us in this democracy base our attitude towards the world upon a fearless search for, and diffusion of, truth in freedom and in peace.

S. P. DUGGAN

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES¹

The most noteworthy activity of the American Association of University Professors has been its defense of academic freedom. For that, and for that alone of all its activities, it is known both in educational circles and among the laity. On the character and effectiveness of the defense its reputation will continue to rest in the immediate future, whether its members would have it so or not.

The Association has not been the only defender of academic freedom during the last two decades, but it has been by far the most conspicuous champion of that cause. It may fairly be credited with dissipating the conspiracy of tactful silence in which the problem of academic freedom was formerly shrouded and with focusing so brilliant a spotlight upon it that no institution, however insulated, however smug and well-disciplined, can longer pretend that the problem does not exist. Moreover, the Association has defined and redefined the various component elements of the problem as no other individual or organization has done.

For example, it has seen from the outset that academic freedom and security of tenure go together, that one can not be had without the other. Thus it has emphasized the crucial importance to colleges and universities of a policy of definite and stable tenure of office and of judicial procedures for the abrogation of tenure. Indeed, the Association is responsible in a larger measure than any other agency for the formulation and spread of the principles which should guide the policies of higher institutions with respect to free inquiry, free speech, and the conditions of academic employment; principles which do now in fact guide the policies of the most enlightened institutions.

These are truly momentous accomplishments. They have taken great courage as well as intelligence. The Association may be safely armored in anonymity; but its individual members are not. Its officers and investigating committees have run risks, risks of contumely and misrepresentation, if not more sensible risks. But as the result of their labors the academic profession occupies today a position of greater dignity and influence than it has ever before held in this country. Its professional morale is higher. If the Association had done nothing else—and it has performed many other useful services—its existence would be amply justified.

And yet academic freedom is not secure. Every year the professor's rights of unhampered inquiry, publication, and utterance are somewhere challenged or denied; to the accompaniment of much human misery. Every year institutions are somewhere temporarily disrupted and the progress of higher education is retarded. Academic freedom is still an issue. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it is at last an

¹ Address delivered at the Annual Meeting, December 28, 1936.

issue, concrete, visible, and clear-cut. As I have already implied, the Association's general pronouncements and local victories have made it so.

An issue of this character, concerning which opinions are so sharply and often so honestly divided, on both sides of which the interests are of such magnitude, will finally have to be settled one way or the other. Before a settlement can be reached there is bound to be some more fighting; plenty of it, I believe, and perhaps fiercer fighting than we have yet seen. Who are to constitute the profession's shock troops, and how shall they conduct their campaign? Those are the questions I should like to discuss with you. They are questions which, since you have taken the leadership in the fight for academic freedom thus far, are of primary concern to you.

I shall now venture to be candidly critical of the Association. The criticism, I hope you will believe, is friendly in purpose, even though you may find its substance unpalatable.

You do not need to be told that the Association is not universally beloved. It is respected, or it is feared, or it is detested, or it is scorned; but it is not beloved. Its representatives, when on inquiry bent, are not welcome guests. Almost any institution would rather be visited by the ten plagues of Egypt. And the immediate effect of some of the Association's visits has been about as disastrous.

I recognize, of course, that an investigation by outsiders of the facts in any case where it is alleged that a professor's tenure rights have been violated, or his legitimate freedom of expression abridged, can hardly under any circumstances be a pleasant experience for the insiders. There is certain to be tension. The defense is tempted to assume a militant posture. The explosion point of passions is lowered. These are inevitable concomitants of any such inquiry, however and by whomsoever conducted. But I believe the long-range results of the Association's investigations would have been far more favorable to the acceptance of the principles of academic freedom and tenure, far less productive of dangerous post-operative shock, if certain fundamental policies of the Association had been different. I hope the Association will agree with me and will alter these policies. If it does so, I can not promise that it will be beloved, but I am sure that its future activities in defense of academic freedom will meet with less resistance and resentment.

Specifically I charge the Association with two serious mistakes and with certain hardly less serious errors of omission. Its first and worst mistake was its decision relating to the eligibility of administrative officers for active membership. Presidents were made ineligible. The eligibility of deans has been hedged about by fluctuating and unflattering provisos which have clearly shown that the Association regards them as objects of suspicion.

What has been the effect of this action? It has split the academic profession. It has created two parties. The tacit assumption of the larger party is that the smaller party is normally and necessarily opposed to it in those matters which are of the highest concern to the profession. The classification is rendered still more invidious by the system of graduated eligibility. Presidents are identified as belonging unqualifiedly to the opposition. The status of deans is equivocal. If eligible at all for admission to the larger party, they are subject to a suspended sentence of excommunication.

Whatever may have been the case with respect to deans, every one knows that the Association had in the beginning, and has continued to have, ample provocation for its policy of excluding presidents from membership. In the vast majority of the cases of invasions of academic freedom and tenure rights on which the Association has published reports, the presidents have been revealed as on the side of the enemy. Too many times the president in his own person has been the enemy. His autocratic temper, his prejudice, his obscurantism, his cowardice in the face of external pressure, his misconception of the purposes of a university, his capriciousness, his vanity, his dishonesty, his bad judgment—one or more of these traits or weaknesses, coupled with the power which the American plan of university control places in the president's hands, has led to a situation which the Association has felt warranted in exposing to the public. These reports, now numbered by the score, covering a period of more than twenty years, present an appalling panorama of ignorance and sin. If one were to judge by this body of evidence alone, the conclusion would be inescapable that the presidencies of American higher institutions are commonly occupied by knaves or fools.

But, of course, such is not the case. The evidence referred to is only fractional. It is the police court record of the presidential population. A large majority of that population is made up of relatively innocent, fairly industrious citizens who have been drawn from the professorial ranks and who, equally with their professorial colleagues, are committed to the promotion of the interests of higher education and research. By training, by long-established habit of mind, by every impulse of sympathy, they are of the guild. The guild may cast them out, but by that action it can not make them over into something else. They remain professors still. And one after another they have demonstrated that fact, often in critical situations where they have jeopardized their careers. I venture the assertion that the presidents of the country have done more than any other body of men—not excluding this Association—to stabilize and protect the professor's calling, to establish its privileges and immunities, and to raise its economic level. Nor should it be

forgotten that in the defense of the principles of academic freedom the presidents spoke first, long before the organization of this Association; and that they have continued to speak. Second only to your own contributions to the exposition of these principles have been the contributions of the presidential orators and essayists, East and West and North and South for something like half a century.

I would not be understood to imply that there is or ever can be complete community of interest between presidents and members of faculties. Certain obligations of the president's office set him apart from the other employees of the institution. The foremost of these divisive obligations is the president's responsibility for the final decision as to how the institution's educational funds shall be spent. The levels at which the president's determination of the allocation of funds begins vary from institution to institution. The size of the institution is a factor in the variety. But in almost every institution, at some stage or other in the process of allocation, the president has the last word. His decisions therefore affect either directly or indirectly departmental appropriations for all major purposes, including salaries and promotions. This is inevitably so, no matter how democratic the general policies of administration may be.

This single obligation of the president is enough to erect a barrier between him and his colleagues. If he is in the main discreet and just, the barrier may not be very high. Hands may be stretched across it and conversations carried on in conversational tones, but both sides are always conscious that the barrier is there. I see no way of getting it down, short of the adoption of the millennial proposal—sponsored by certain members of the profession—that the president's office be abolished. And the advent of the millennium is very likely to be delayed beyond the life-time of any of us here present.

The president is likewise required to interpret the educational activities of the institution to the trustees, and with them to shape the larger administrative policies. This obligation also tends to separate him from his professional associates. The teaching staff is prone to regard him as the trustees' man and to believe that if ever trustees and teachers are at variance the president will of necessity be found on the side of the board. As a surveyor I have had the opportunity of investigating a great many colleges and universities. I have often encountered this view of the trustee-presidential relationship. I have seldom discovered the slightest justification for it. Far more frequently the situation is reversed. The trustees are the president's men. They look to him for direction. They back him up in his decisions and even in his mistakes, and not until he has made too many do they get rid of him for the institution's good.

Ideally, of course, the president is nobody's man. He is the institu-

tion's man, the only officer charged with the responsibility to the institution as a whole. The trustees appoint him, but not to carry out their behests. They expect him to understand all of the institution's activities, to coordinate such of them as are properly related, to interpret one group within the institution to another, to stimulate, to mediate, to advise and to plan; to advise the board and help the board plan those measures which lie within its exclusive province; to advise the faculty and participate in the faculty's plans for educational changes and improvements. The bulk of the president's time and energy is devoted to matters which concern faculties and students, not to matters which are the primary concerns of the board. The presidency is an educational office. Wherever it is less than that, or other than that, it is an unmitigated affliction. Unfortunately there are a few afflicted institutions. But, although the ideal conditions are seldom realized, I believe that the overwhelming majority both of board members and of presidents conceive of the presidency as an educational office and do their fallible best to translate the conception into fact. It is of the highest consequence to the academic profession that this conception be universally accepted. This Association, as representing the profession, has an obligation to further the spread of the conception.

On the assumption, I suppose, that he who touches pitch can not but be defiled, deans, because they also are concerned with administration, share some of the president's disabilities. If their duties are wholly administrative, then, in the eyes of this Association, the tenuous link which binds them to the profession is broken. Not even the extraordinarily good behavior of certain deans, both in the teaching and non-teaching classifications, has sufficed to win for this body of officers unquestioned professional standing.

The Association's mistake with respect to its membership policy rests, it seems to me, on a misunderstanding of the nature and objects of educational administration. Educational administration is a necessary institutional function. Without it no institution could operate. Its sole purpose is to facilitate the processes of teaching and research, and to promote improvements in these processes. Experience has abundantly demonstrated that the most essential qualification for educational administration on the university level is a first-hand knowledge of the problems and points of view of teachers and investigators. Deanships are practically never held by persons drawn from outside the academic profession. Generally the incumbents have previously achieved distinction as professors. Less and less often are outsiders appointed to presidencies. Educational administration has therefore become one of the functions of the academic profession. The profession as a whole is expected to produce the number of qualified persons required to man the

deanships and presidencies in which the land abounds. The profession as a whole, and individual members of it especially, are apt to feel aggrieved if appointing officers seek administrators from beyond its ranks. Moreover, if a dean or a president finds administration uncongenial to him, or if the institution finds him uncongenial to administration, he expects to be received back into the teaching branch of the academic profession. No serious obstacles lie in his way if he is a dean—and even presidents occasionally return whence they came.

We are now in fact two bodies. But in essence we are one profession. The duties of some of us may differ from those of others. We are attached to institutions in which there are complex patterns of authority and responsibility. To some of us one sort of a post is assigned and to some another sort. In the day's work there are many things that divide us. But what we have in common is of far greater extent and significance. Above all there is this central cause of academic freedom, with all that the phrase implies. If that cause is not won, our profession can hold no attraction for men of spirit and intelligence. As we go to do battle for that cause there should be no division of our forces. The weak and faint-hearted among us, whether they be deans or presidents or professors, should be fortified and sustained by the consciousness of belonging to a united profession.

The remedy for the division which exists is in the hands of the Association. I am aware that your Council has recently had under consideration a proposal providing for the admission to membership of administrative officers on equal terms with professors. I hope that the Association will see fit to adopt the proposal.

The second mistake which I think the Association has made is of quite recent date. I refer to the new practice of blacklisting institutions in which the official policies have been found, during the investigation of a specific case, to be inimical to academic freedom and security of tenure. The term "blacklisting" is mine; the Association's term is more euphemistic. But no matter what you call it, blacklisting is what it is.

By adopting this practice the Association has entered upon the singularly hazardous business of institutional classification. The country has had some thirty years of experience with institutional classification. Classification has been carried on by national and regional associations, by state departments of education, and by bodies representing a variety of special interests. The experience should be illuminating, if the human race—even that part of it which is occupied with higher education—is able to learn by any other means than personal trial and error.

The results of all classifying enterprises may be summed up very

briefly. If a large number of institutions in any group has been guilty of abuses, the public separation of the sheep from the goats has usually stopped the most flagrant of these abuses. The goats have been metamorphosed into sheep, or they have died. That is the sole credit accomplishment, and only a very few of the classifying enterprises can show that much. But there is a heavy debit side. There has never been a just classification. Either the criteria are too limited, or they are not significant, or they are not applied with sufficient discrimination. The effect of an unfavorable rating is devastating to the institution which is the victim. Invariably its development is retarded. Invariably its morale is lowered. It may be permanently ruined. Nor has any classifying agency ever taken a broad and statesmanlike view of local and regional needs for educational facilities. Consequently all classifications have tended to deflect creative forces within communities and to throw individual institutions out of balance. The more awe-inspiring the penalties which a classifying agency imposes for delinquency, the more serious is the damage it does to institutions and to the orderly evolution of American higher education. And the agency itself is fully entitled to the harvest of bitterness and hate which its efforts to reform the institutions of a democracy by force have won for it. For whether its lists be white or black or graded, they represent the application of force; a force as potent as the law of the state.

It has disturbed me deeply to see this Association join the sincere but misguided company which for a full generation has wrought such misery and harm. But I have other reasons to object to the particular classifying enterprise on which you have embarked. The Association's classification can make no pretense to being anything but accidental. Therefore it is bound to be incomplete and hence from the start unjust. Would any one here be bold enough to assert that those institutions which you have caught *in flagrante delicto* are the only ones in which the principles of academic freedom are officially flouted; or that they represent even the worst exhibits on the map of the United States? Yet these few are pilloried and others equally or more guilty escape, unless or until they commit some overt act which may subject them to your ministrations. The Association is not equipped—nor is it likely to be—to make a comprehensive inspection of the colleges of the country and to determine which are and which are not chemically pure. If it can not do this, I maintain that it has no moral right to single out a handful of institutions and to warn the world away from them with the cry: "Unclean, unclean!"

But a still more serious objection to this practice is that punishment is visited upon the wrong people. The persons responsible for the conditions within an institution which incur the Association's dis-

pleasure are generally prepared to brazen it out. The drastic nature of the penalty only stiffens their resistance. It may well induce a martyr complex. Moreover, members and friends of the institution who would not approve of the acts which have led to the blacklisting are drawn by institutional loyalty to side with the offenders, since it is the whole institution that stands publicly condemned, and not certain officers of the institution. And who are the real sufferers? Persons innocent of any offense; students who are in no wise responsible and who perhaps can not go anywhere else; teachers, often valued members of this body, who have given hostages to fortune in the place where they are and who can not leave if they would. Theirs is the deepest humiliation, theirs the painful sensation of being identified with guilt without being guilty. Unlike W. S. Gilbert's immortal dispenser of justice, the Association has not made the punishment fit the crime.

But why such a punishment at all? If you had failed to bring about reforms in the administration of higher education by the peaceful and dignified methods of investigation and publication of the findings, you might be pardoned for resorting finally to more militant devices. But you have not failed. You have succeeded brilliantly. The elder statesmen of this body do not need to be reminded of the numerous instances in which institutions have radically altered their tenure policies, after the Association had pointed out the error of their ways. To the younger members of the Association I recommend a careful study of this unique chapter of academic history. By the compulsive persuasion of facts marshalled with skill and fairness, and of principles cogently argued—by educational methods, in other words—this Association has gradually changed opinions and practices in scores of institutions throughout the United States. Practices changed under pressure of fear are changed grudgingly and may easily be changed back, once the pressure is lifted. But when opinions are changed as the result of greater enlightenment the change is thorough-going, and it is permanent. What more would you have? You do not need this new weapon of the blacklist. The use of it does not comport with your past or with the educational ideals which this Association should embody. To persist in its use can only lower the prestige of the profession.

I count the Association's action on the two matters I have been discussing as its major mistakes in the domain of positive policy. I think it has erred in at least two other directions by not being positive enough.

In whose behalf must those trustees and presidents who uphold the principles of academic freedom and tenure most often wage a defensive battle against inflamed constituents and alumni? Every one here knows the answer. In behalf of incompetents and exhibitionists. The Association has repeatedly asserted that it has no intention of helping

the lazy or unfit teacher to hold his position. All it demands for him is due notice and fair treatment. It has repeatedly deplored exhibitionism and has emphasized the solemn obligation resting upon scholars to be temperate, considerate, and impartial in their utterances both inside and outside the classroom. But I am convinced that these declarations have accomplished practically nothing. Many an institution which values its reputation as a defender of the faith literally does not dare to proceed against a notoriously unfit teacher, lest its action be followed by charges of infringement of his rights, and by the appearance on the campus of Committee A. That fact is well known among the weaker brethren of the profession. It is their ace in the hole. The administration may have every confidence that Committee A would exonerate the institution. But that is not good enough. An investigation by this Association is a calamity, major or minor depending on the nature of the verdict. It is less of a calamity to put up with a few incompetent professors. I am persuaded that institutions should not have to choose between these two alternatives.

But after all it is the exhibitionist who constitutes the most difficult problem. Among the current enemies of academic freedom he is one of the most dangerous, because by his abuse of the high privilege of the profession he puts that privilege in jeopardy for all of us. At times it is almost impossible to defend him because he is actually unworthy of defense. If he belonged to any other profession no one would defend him. Nevertheless—and now I speak as an administrator—we must defend him, of that I am profoundly convinced; defend him at the risk of our official lives if need be. The reason, of course, is plain. If those who control a professor's employment attempt to place any metes and bounds whatsoever to academic freedom there is no academic freedom. Within the limits imposed by the law of the land it is absolute, or it is non-existent. Therefore trustees and presidents must interpose themselves between a justly outraged community and individuals whom they do not respect. They must at least condone platform behavior which fills them with disgust. They must allow their institutions to be disgraced and derided. These things they must do for the sake of a cause which often seems very remote and abstract, and which the public does not understand. It is a hard assignment. That it is not always fulfilled is not surprising. But many times it is fulfilled—at a fearful price to the institution.

Must we forever continue to pay this price? Can the profession devise no protection against the mountebanks within its own ranks who, to feed their own vanity, recklessly stake the profession's most precious and hardly won possession? I do not know. But I am sure that this Association which acts for the profession ought to address itself far more

earnestly to this problem than it has yet done. The older professional organizations in the fields of law and medicine have found ways to deal with their members who bring obloquy upon these professions.

Since it is patent that the exhortations of the Association have altogether failed to curb this menace which threatens us from within, I venture with some hesitation to suggest a possible course of procedure. It may prove on examination to be impracticable. But I submit it for examination.

National headquarters are a long way from the local arenas in which these irresponsible members of the profession disport themselves. The officers and committees of the Association speak to them only in cold print. Trustees and presidents can not speak at all without incurring the suspicion that they are subtly interfering with the right of free speech. But the local chapters of this Association can speak to their erring members in tones that can be heard, and still remain clear of any such suspicion. Of course, I am not suggesting that a local chapter should censor or disapprove the substance of any professor's utterances. However provocative, however unpopular, however bizarre the results of his research and reflection may be, we all insist on his unqualified right to make these results public orally or in writing. But we also insist that the manner of his presentation shall befit the dignity and responsibility of the professor's calling. It is with the manner of their colleagues' utterances that I suggest the local chapters may appropriately concern themselves. For the members of the same chapter suffer first and most keenly whenever one of their number violates the proprieties of the profession.

The proposal, if workable at all, is, I admit, only palliative. The symptoms which it is designed temporarily to relieve are symptoms of an insidious disease which may, if it is not checked, sap the strength of our professional body. There is only one sure remedy. That is the development of a code of professional ethics and the slow inculcation of it in all the young members of the profession during the course of their professional training. I am aware that the Association has already set its hand to this important task.

The question of professional ethics brings me to my last point. In default of a code it is the Association's duty currently to make clear to its members not only their rights and their general responsibilities, but also the peculiar limitations which membership in the profession places upon their actions. By and large, and especially in the past, it has done so. But lately, it appears to have ignored one formidable threat to the integrity of the academic profession which inheres in the recent action of some of its most respected members. I have seen in its publications no discussion of the issues which are raised when a university instructor

joins a teachers' union affiliated with organized labor. The American Federation of Teachers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, is reported to be carrying on a campaign to enlist college and university teachers. Local branches of the Federation in which members of the staffs of higher institutions are prominent have already begun to appear. A movement to unionize the academic profession is evidently under way.

I am measuring my words when I say that if this movement spreads it will be fatal to the academic profession. The reason is so obvious that I wonder how wise and responsible scholars can have overlooked it.

Beyond a decent livelihood, what do we as a profession ask of American society? First of all the privilege of free speech which the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every citizen. Certain other citizens, some of them very influential citizens, would deny us this common privilege. To make our case is easy. And, although we are sometimes defeated, in the main we are winning our case.

But that is not all we ask of American society. We ask also for something much more difficult to justify. We ask immunity from the usual consequences of exercising the privilege of free speech. We ask that our jobs shall be secure and that we be advanced in our jobs without reference to the popularity of our utterances. Though we may attack the people's most cherished convictions and beliefs, we ask to be protected against every form of reprisal. That is what academic freedom really means.

Lawyers and doctors and business men ask no such immunity. The right of free speech is theirs. But if in exercising it they give public offense, they know perfectly well they will have to pay the price in the loss of public esteem, and hence probably in the loss of clients, or patients, or customers. To fly in the face of public opinion requires of them a brand of courage which we, if we win complete academic freedom, will not have to display.

We are justified in asking immunity from the penalties which democratic societies inflict upon non-conformists only on one condition. That is, that we shall be partisans of no organized interest within the state, not even of the organized interest of education itself. We are analysts, critics, and explorers. We ask society's permission to take all the phenomena of nature and of human life under our observation and report what we see. We ask immunity from interference in order that we may single-mindedly perform these tasks which are vital to the welfare and progress of society. If society is to have faith in our loyalty to the cause of truth, it must never have occasion to suspect that that loyalty is divided.

As individual citizens we are at liberty to join any group within the

social order that is not proscribed by the law. As individuals we may join the Democratic Party or the Baptist Church or the Grange or the Liberty League or the Knights of Columbus or the Masons. If before we became professors we were typographers or musicians or carpenters, there is not the slightest reason why we should not belong to the union of our trade. But the academic profession can not identify itself with any of these organizations. In our capacity as university professors we can not join a labor union and thereby commit ourselves to support the interests of organized labor. If the academic profession, or any considerable part of it, decides to cast in its lot with organized labor, then it becomes a partisan. Then, should a clash of interests arise, its allegiance to the cause of truth can properly be called in question. Then it no longer has any right to demand immunities which other groups of citizens do not enjoy. Then it must abandon its claim to academic freedom. We can not have it both ways.

This, members of the Association, is the sum total of my criticism. I said at the beginning of these remarks that it is friendly in purpose. I have ventured to offer it—and I suspect unwarrantably to tax your patience—only because of my profound admiration for the Association's accomplishments and because of my hope that through the stimulation of an outsider's comment these accomplishments may be fortified and extended.

S. P. CAPEN

COMMENTS ON THE ADDRESS BY DR. CAPEN

*O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as ithers see us.*

The argument for solidarity of all those professionally engaged in higher education has very real attractiveness when so persuasively and graciously presented by a guest who, it will be recalled by those present, referred to the opportunity as "an answer to prayer." There are, to be sure, passages in the address which suggest misgivings as to the homogeneity needful in an organization already combining workers all the way from archeology to zymology. As Dr. Capen justly says, "Certain obligations of the president's office set him apart from the other employees of the institution. . . . This single obligation of the president is enough to erect a barrier between him and his colleagues. . . . Hands may be stretched across it . . . but both sides are always conscious that the barrier is there." Dr. Capen speaks of the omission of the administrators as a mistake. To our founders it was fundamental.

If an organization including both professors and presidents was needed at all there was no sufficient reason for any new organization rather than, for example, the development of a college division of the N.E.A. as a national association for higher education. The American Council on Education, of which Dr. Capen was the first Director (and the A. A. U. P. a constituent member), was in fact, until its recent expansion, based upon such a comprehensive representation of all groups engaged in higher education. The *a priori* argument is always against the establishment of a new organization, which can be justified only by the recognition of a specific need not otherwise met. This need was clearly defined in the discussion at the organization meeting December, 1915 (and many times since) as the representation of the common professional interests of those who are themselves directly engaged in teaching or research and not merely in the management of such activities by others. The fact that the non-inclusion of administrative officers implied, however, no hostile intent has been admirably expressed in the recent report of the Committee on Organization and Policy,¹ which might well have been adopted as a declaration of principle by the Association. It has also been continuously expressed by the retention under a constitutional provision of a large number of presidents of institutions in our lists of Honorary and Associate members, among whom I mention as the first

¹ The Association is an organization for the formulation and expression of the opinion of those members of the staffs of universities and colleges who are primarily teachers and investigators rather than administrators. Deans who are also teachers are eligible, as well as heads of departments. The purely administrative officers already have organizations through which they can express their opinions. In expressing this view the Committee wishes to emphasize that the present form of organization of the Association is not based upon hostility to administrators but merely upon a belief that it is desirable to have an organization through which the opinion of those who are primarily teachers and investigators can be formulated and expressed. The Committee believes that bringing in persons who are primarily administrators might well defeat its own end and tend to promote rather than decrease hostility to those in administrative positions.

in a long list ex-President Ames, Johns Hopkins; President Angell, Yale, President Atwood, Clark; President Aydelotte, Swarthmore; President Benedict, Texas; President Comfort, Haverford; President Compton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. All of these had previously been Active members of the Association. The only administrative officers to whom such membership was not open were those who had not been Active members prior to taking their administrative positions. A number of these Associate and Honorary members as well as Chancellor Capen himself have served on committees of the Association.

Cooperative relations with administrative officers and their associations have been systematically cultivated for many years through the American Council on Education or otherwise, notably with the Association of American Colleges, by occasional correspondence and conferences in regard to matters of common interest, by exchange of representation at annual meetings, and by consultative relations in recent years with the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of Colleges. We have had invited addresses at our Annual Meetings prior to that of Chancellor Capen by President Ames (Johns Hopkins), President Aydelotte (Swarthmore), President Mason (Chicago), President Wilkins (Oberlin), and President Wriston (Brown) among others. There has been no lack of cordial relations with the administrative officers except as this has sometimes inevitably arisen in connection with controversial issues of academic freedom and tenure. Even in this connection it is significant that a president who was adversely criticized in an early report of the committee has, not long since, appealed to us to assist in the protection of institutions in which freedom of speech was imperiled by outside pressure groups. An ex-president of a state university whose tenure was somewhat abruptly terminated, recognizing at the end of a protracted conference that the situation was not one with which we could consistently deal, deplored the fact that there was no agency which could do for a president in his position what we are able to accomplish for professors. In other words the so-called "split" of the academic profession was not of our making. Our founders were merely too clear-sighted and sensible to ignore its existence. Dr. Capen's condemnation of "autocratic temper" and other less admirable qualities—"vanity," "dishonesty," "bad judgment," which he attributes to some presidents—as one who knows them less intimately might hardly venture to do—would seem measurably to justify the policy of exclusion. For how could we in advance of investigation discriminate among them? "Educational administration is a necessary institutional function," but this argument if valid would seem hardly less applicable to financial administration and would imply the inclusion of treasurers and perhaps of trustees, if not superintendents of buildings.

Dr. Capen's recognition of the positive accomplishments of the Association in defending academic freedom and tenure during the past two decades is most generous and comprehensive, and we have long appreciated, as repeatedly expressed by quotation of his utterances in the *Bulletin*, that he is one of its strongest champions in this country. He refers with entire accuracy to the fact that we were not the first in the field, that the importance of academic freedom had long been recognized by administrative officers and others. Yet it seems fair, as a matter of completeness of statement, to ask what presidents have in fact ever done outside their own institutions, and to point out that while excellent *doctrine* had been abundant, practical *execution* by the necessary machinery was lacking until we entered the field in 1915. As in Mark Twain's historic remark about the weather, everybody *talked* about academic freedom and tenure but nobody *did* anything. Until that time the victim of injustice had no appeal except to unorganized public opinion.

We have been so often accused (by critics on the left) of exerting no influence by our reports that it is much to be hoped that the gallant band who persistently allege that we have "no teeth" may take to heart the convincing statements of Dr. Capen as to the dread among administrative evil-doers, which our activities have inspired.

It is a pleasure to agree with Dr. Capen that college and university presidents as a class are high-minded and that they are earnestly and effectively engaged in doing the best they can to discharge the difficult and often impossible duties which have been imposed upon them. We naturally hear far too much about the minority who are not thus high-minded or who lack the experience or wisdom to discharge their duties with reasonable success.

As to protection of the unworthy, Dr. Capen could not possibly be aware of the extent to which we have assisted administrative officers in dealing with difficult situations. He admits that we have repeatedly expressed general disapprobation of incompetent or unworthy members of our profession but alleges that this has been preaching without performance. Evidently this can only mean that the actual performance, which is known only to the officers of the Association, has not been published, for reasons which will surely suggest themselves on a little reflection. Without making any review of the record, I call to mind in recent years four cases in which we have declined to defend men whom it would probably not be unfair to include in the "incompetent" and "exhibitionist" groups. To make this a bit more specific without mentioning names, Professor A, being criticized for political activity, attempted to mitigate the offense by continuing such activity under an assumed name. Professor B's statements about the administration were of so intemperate a quality as to leave no doubt that his return to

the institution should not be considered. Professor C had prejudiced his case by newspaper publicity likely to be harmful to the institution. Professor D alleged unethical conduct by his department chief without supporting evidence. We gave indirect support to the administration in dealing with each of these difficult situations.

On the other hand Dr. Capen's statement that trustees and presidents must interpose themselves between a justly outraged community and individuals whom they do not respect seems somewhat extreme in view of the paramount rights of the students concerned. If administrators and trustees have been so unfortunate or so careless as to appoint incompetents or exhibitionists to academic positions implying permanent tenure they can hardly escape a measure of financial responsibility, but we should not maintain that the undesirable members of the profession are entitled to perpetual immunity rather than to due notice and a fair hearing.

The value of the suggestion that our chapters might exert a salutary influence in at least moral discipline of these less responsible members could also be illustrated by actual examples in which they have done so, but it must be borne in mind that the chapters can hardly ever act with the necessary disinterestedness and independence.

As to the recent publication of a so-called "black list," this short list makes in reality no claim whatever to be one of institutions in which tenure conditions are unsatisfactory. It is merely a list of those which we have removed for definite reasons from our general eligible list. The efficacy of this removal as a remedial measure has been indicated by the improvement in tenure conditions at DePauw University, now restored to the eligible list, and by overtures made by the president of one of the other institutions on the list. The A. A. U. P. is *not* a classifying agency and urgent appeals that it undertake classification of institutions as to tenure policies have been sturdily and thus far successfully resisted by the officers and the Council. At the same time Dr. Capen's sweeping criticism of all classifying agencies does not seem fairly applicable to the Association of American Universities, the American Association of University Women, the North Central Association, and similar agencies which have rendered this rather thankless service.

On the remaining criticism as to the inexpediency of a trade union policy, it seems hardly necessary to express more than general agreement with Dr. Capen, since no such policy has ever been favorably considered by our Association. We have, of course, no responsibility for the contrary policy of the American Federation of Teachers even though we have members in common.

The continued maintenance of academic freedom and tenure is, as Dr. Capen has elsewhere cogently argued, the duty of trustees as well as of

administrators and professors—indeed of all good citizens. This great cause different groups can serve in different ways, carefully avoiding such unnecessary friction with each other as shall give aid and comfort to the common enemy.

H. W. TYLER

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTES FROM THE WASHINGTON OFFICE

Chapter Letter No. 1 for 1937 was issued February 19. It includes a section on membership with a letter used by the Boston University chapter; and a section on resolutions by chapters or regional groups, quoting the following general statement of policy:

"When a chapter or region speaks in the form of resolutions or letters to administrators, trustees, legislators, or the press, such communications are often interpreted as declarations of the national Association's policy. For this reason, in order to avoid confusion, it is wise to submit such material first to the officers of the Association to ascertain whether it is in line with the Association's policy. When the Association has taken definite official action, as in the case of teachers' oath legislation, then, of course, joint action by chapter and regional groups is desirable and there is no need to take the precaution of making an initial inquiry of the national officers."

Chapters are requested to do all in their power to give publicity to the Richmond resolution on teachers' oath legislation (see *January Bulletin*, page 7). Announcement is made of the special pamphlet on "Freedom and the Teacher," referred to elsewhere in this issue. Copies of the condensed stenographic report of the annual meeting are still available to a limited extent at \$5.00 each.

Contrary to certain newspaper reports, the Association has taken no official action with reference to the termination of office of the president at the University of Wisconsin. The Association was not requested by President Frank, by the Board of Regents, or by the faculty of the University to take any action. There has been no indication at any time that general conditions of tenure at the University or freedom of speech were involved.

Pursuant to By-Law 1, Council Letter II, dated January 22, invited suggestions for membership on the Council's Executive Committee for 1937 and for membership on the Nominating Committee. Council Letter III, dated January 26, included the tentative budget for 1937 prepared by the General Secretary and the Treasurer. The covering letter called attention to the large expense for Council travel in 1936, which is to be reduced in 1937 by holding only one meeting apart from the sessions at the annual meeting. Council Letter IV, dated February 11, asked approval of a recommendation that the Treasurer of the Association be authorized to pay rebates in full to all chapters whose applications are received by March 1 and that an appropriation covering such an amount be authorized. The applications for rebates received to

that date amounted to \$1765.59, and the present appropriation is \$1000, which is the usual initial sum. In view of the increasing demands on the Association for services to the profession and the present extremely limited budget, the General Secretary and the Treasurer suggested that the Council at the spring meeting carefully consider the proposal to discontinue the payment of chapter rebates or authorize a much smaller rebate, which will be available to all chapters applying.

At the annual meeting, it was voted by the Council to remove St. John's College from the eligible list of the Association in view of the recent action by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in removing this institution from its accredited list.

The record of the Council meetings at Richmond was circulated not only to the members of the Council, but to chapter officers and members of all Association committees on January 27. The chapter officers also received a list of proposals submitted by the chapters for consideration at the annual meeting (see February *Bulletin*, pages 101-102).

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

In the December issue of the *Bulletin* of the Association, the general topics include the Progress of Art Education, A Hearing for the Disciplines, and Professional Trends. Under the second, President-Emeritus Lowell discusses briefly "Concentration and Atmosphere." Another contribution in this section is a well-organized, concise summary of "The Discipline of the Natural Sciences" by R. E. Scammon, from which the following is quoted:

"Learning in the latter days of the Middle Ages certainly showed no sharp distinction between the scientist and the scholar. That forging of the tools of dialectic and precision of expression which we find among the often abused schoolmen was fundamental to all modern scientific thought. Many scientists are apt to look upon the fine-drawn distinctions of the schoolmen as a quite worthless web of words; yet, if the century-long battle between nominalism and realism had not been fought and if realism had not won a substantial victory, modern science, like modern jurisprudence, would be quite impossible. The recognition that physical phenomena tend at least to fall into regular patterns is what makes modern science possible, and this recognition is but the extension of the schoolmen's contention for realism. . . .

"It seems to me that the real parting of the ways of the scholar and the scientist occurred early in the last century, although, like most dates in the history of culture, this must be regarded only as a conventional one. It seems to me also that this parting was due very largely to the development of specific and sometimes only mechanical scientific tech-

niques. Technique rather than thought changed the whole flow of scientific investigation; and with each development of a new technique, a new branch of science and, in universities, a new laboratory or department arose. This fission of knowledge was reflected not only in the accomplishments but in the very character of men of science. The broader view was replaced by the narrower one. Knowledge grew in intensity but lessened in breadth. It was a glorious period of scientific advance when, as has been said, one might prick an animal membrane with a pin and make a world-wide discovery. But like most advantages this one exacted its price. . . .

"... With the enormous increase in knowledge, the man of science of the future can hardly be expected to be expert in other fields than his own. But what we may hope is that the training of the future scientist will be sufficiently broad to develop in him an appreciation of other branches of learning and that through this appreciation will come a fuller synthesis of the presentation of knowledge."

In the section "Methods and Tools," E. S. Jones, in appraising the "Present Status of Tests and Measurements in Our Colleges" makes the following points:

"1. We need further studies to determine whether achievement or prognostic testing can safely predict success along certain college fields as compared with others.

"2. We need a much wider range of testing, some types which are not of the paper-and-pencil variety. We have overdrawn on purely verbal ability and given too little attention to mechanical aptitude and to social gestures. We must get away from the point of view that the only tests worth administering are those quickly given and scored.

"3. We need a better control of our mass test administration so that a few unscrupulous or careless administrators may not spoil the efforts of the great majority to maintain an honest and experimental point of view.

"4. Finally, we should be careful that our test scores and cumulative record system do not hamper our more informal relationships with students. Frequently, the most revealing material we have on a student is something that does not fit into a cumulative record, or perhaps should not be written down at all."

In the editorial section, Dr. Kelly outlines under a number of headings "Changing Criteria for Testing College Teachers," enumerating "four significant studies" as follows: his own "pioneer" survey, "Great Teachers and Methods of Developing Them," Bulletin, Association of American Colleges, March, 1929; the report of Committee U of our Association on College and University Teaching, May, 1933; Dr. Anna Y. Reed, "The Effective and Ineffective College Teacher;" and Payne

and Spieth, "An Open Letter to College Teachers," based on work of Committee U. He discusses "inspectorial visitations" of classes by administrative officers, referring at length to suggestions on this subject in the report of Committee U and suggesting that friendly visits by department heads might be of utmost value to younger teachers.

ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES

In the Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting, at Detroit in November, 1936, the opening paper by C. S. Marsh, of the American Council on Education, "Some Comments on the Master's Degree," reviews the history of the degree statistically from the beginning of the present century, a period during which there has been a progressive increase from 1744 in 1900 to 17,288 in 1934. A comparison of the numbers granted in 1931-32 and 1933-34 shows, however, certain marked changes. In 12 state universities, selected apparently at random, there has been a decrease from 3977 to 3375, and in 12 endowed universities from 6409 to 5727. On the contrary, during the same period 12 liberal arts colleges show an increase from 232 to 298, and 12 tax-supported state teachers colleges from 262 to 372. Two endowed teachers colleges show decreases during the same period: George Peabody from 303 to 134, and Teachers College (Columbia) from 2180 to 1878. 32 members of the Association of Urban Universities show an increase from 4534 to 4821, with wide fluctuations among the individual members. Dr. Marsh concludes a discussion of possible causes with the statement: "Not only the present status but the future prospects of the Master's degree call for penetrating study. The American Council on Education hopes, in the near future, to undertake such a study in cooperation with committees from professional and regional associations."

W. C. John, Senior Specialist in Higher Education, United States Office of Education, follows with a discussion of "The Urban Universities and Research," treating the matter historically and connecting his discussion with that of Dean Richardson of Brown University, previously referred to in the *Bulletin*. Other papers in the program included "Urban Universities and Urban Politics," Frederick Siedenburgh of the University of Detroit; "College Aptitude of Adult Students," L. A. Froman of the evening session, University of Buffalo; "The Comparative Abilities of Extension and Non-Extension Students," Herbert Sorenson, University of Minnesota; "The Urban University and Its Relations to the Community," C. L. Spain, Wayne University.

GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD, ANNUAL REPORT

The annual report for the year ending June 30, 1936, records the summary detail appropriations totaling \$9,489,358, of which those for the

program in general education amounted to \$1,252,460. Fellowships, scholarships, and grants-in-aid total \$475,000. Under the head of General Planning, substantial grants were made to the American Youth Commission, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, and the American Council on Education. Other projects receiving noteworthy support were Comprehensive Curriculum Revision; The Reorganization of Subject Matter Fields; Testing, Evaluation, and Accrediting; Film Programs; Child Study; The Training of Personnel; and a wide variety of activities included under the Southern Program.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, FELLOWSHIPS

In the award of fellowships of post-doctorate grade for the coming year, consideration will be extended to applications in the fields of geology, paleontology, and physical geography. The basic stipend will be \$1600 a year. Requests for application blanks should be addressed to the Secretary, National Research Fellowships Board in the Natural Sciences, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Applications should be submitted by April 1.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The February Bulletin of the Institute gives a very extensive list of summer courses abroad, including not only Western Europe but Hawaii, Japan, and Mexico. It is noted that for the first time since 1932 the American Academy in Rome will offer summer courses in classics, history, and related subjects.

JULIUS ROSENWALD FUND

The Fund was established for the sufficiently broad purpose, the well-being of mankind. It had further the unusual provision that the endowment must be entirely expended within twenty-five years of the founder's death. The chief efforts of the Fund have been to better the condition of negroes, especially through education, and to improve race relations. Its first and greatest undertaking has been cooperation with southern states and local districts in building school houses for negroes, while its most notable effort in higher education has been aid in the development of the university centers in Washington, Atlanta, Nashville, and New Orleans. The total amount expended for negro activities has been nearly \$9,000,000 out of the total of more than \$13,000,000. The latter includes \$900,000 for general education, the largest item being a contribution of \$363,658 for the endowment of Swarthmore College. In the same group is an allotment of \$41,403 for the Committee on National Problems and Plans of the American Council on Education.

These facts are reported in the brochure, "Julius Rosenwald Fund: Review of Two Decades, 1917-1936."

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONGRESSES

International Congress of Agricultural Industries

The Hague, July 12-17, 1937

International Congress on the History of Science, Prague, September 22-27, 1937

International Congress of Philosophy

Paris, August 1-6, 1937

International Congress of Physical Education

Paris, July 14, 1937

International Council of Scientific Unions

London, April 26-May 4, 1937

International Geological Congress

Moscow, July 21-29, 1937

International Industrial Relations Institute

The Hague, August 30-September 1, 1937

International Population Congress

Paris, July, 1937

REPRESENTATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS

The Association has received a courteous invitation from the University of Athens to be represented at its Centenary Celebration in April. Professors Roscoe Pound of Harvard University and L. R. Shero of Swarthmore College have been appointed as our representatives on this occasion.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND NOTES

ORGANIZATION AND CONDUCT OF LOCAL CHAPTERS¹

REPORT OF COMMITTEE E

The work carried on under the auspices of Committee E during the present calendar year has followed pretty generally the lines laid down two or three years ago when the Committee was enlarged so as to make it possible for its members to get into more intimate touch with the chapters of their respective districts.² In some districts regional meetings have been held under the direction or supervision of the members of Committee E, while in other districts the members of the Committee have made trips to the various chapters. In the remaining districts the Committee members have contented themselves with communicating with their chapters by mail. There are no two districts that present identical problems, and hence the chairman has felt that no uniform method for conducting the business of the Committee should or could be devised. The fact that several methods are used for solving the problems confronting Committee E in the 16 districts of the Association therefore makes it an experimental committee, par excellence, thus helping to stimulate the work of the Association in various directions.

As the report of the General Secretary contains the statistics concerning the number of members and chapters in the Association, this report will only be concerned with giving a brief summary of the activities of members of the Committee.

In District No. 1 (New England States, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick) these activities have been confined almost exclusively to communications with chapters by mail. The district director, Professor Otto Manthey-Zorn, of Amherst College, reports that a regional meeting was held on March 24 at the University of New Hampshire.

Professor Joseph Allen, of City College, New York, and member of the Committee for District No. 2 (New York State and the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario), has this year shown that his fruitful activity of last year was no temporary thing. As a matter of fact, his work seems to be steadily increasing. He has reported six regional meetings as follows: northeastern New York institutions at Albany, February 8; metropolitan institutions of New York City, February 10; western New York institutions at Rochester, May 2; central New York institutions at Ithaca, May 9; regional meetings at St. Lawrence University and at Skidmore College, October 10 and 31, respectively. A meeting for the chapters at Hobart College, Wells College, and Cornell University

¹ Presented at the Annual Meeting, December 28, 1936.

² The division of states into sixteen districts is given in the *January Bulletin* under the membership of Committee E.

was held April 13 at Geneva. Professor Allen reported that there were 65 in attendance at the Albany meeting on February 8, 91 at Columbia University on February 10, and 55 at Rochester on May 2. The general subject for discussion at the Rochester meeting was "Academic Freedom," with Professor Beyle of Syracuse University making the principal address. The meeting at Cornell University on May 9 was attended by 69 representatives of eight colleges: Colgate University, Cornell University, Hamilton College, Hobart College, Keuka College, St. Lawrence University, Syracuse University, and Wells College. Professor Horace A. Eaton presided at the meeting. Following a brief talk on the general subject of academic freedom by Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, of Cornell University, the principal address was delivered by Dr. Ben D. Wood, of Columbia University, on the subject of "Criteria of Individualized Education." The largest regional meeting in Professor Allen's district was that at Skidmore College on October 31. There were 116 delegates in attendance, representing these 10 colleges: Bard College, Colgate University, New York State College for Teachers, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Russell Sage College, Skidmore College, Syracuse University, Union College, University of Vermont, and Williams College. Following the dinner, three addresses were given on the general topic of "The Place of the Faculty in College Administration," the speakers being Professor Allen, Dean Margaret Bridgman¹ of Skidmore College, and Professor Paul W. Ward of Syracuse University. Having experienced some difficulty at times in securing speakers, Professor Allen has thought it proper to suggest that the traveling expenses of outside speakers might be paid out of the budget of Committee E during the first year or two of regional meetings. He also suggests that regional meetings might be more successfully organized and managed if a registration fee of about 25 cents could be charged each delegate to take care of routine expenses. Besides arranging his regional meetings, Professor Allen has made several trips to visit other chapters. The increase of membership in New York State during the past calendar year can be largely attributed to his untiring and unselfish activity in the interest of the Association.

Professor F. J. Tschan, of Pennsylvania State College, member of Committee E for District No. 3 (New Jersey and Pennsylvania), found it necessary to cancel a meeting scheduled for last spring in Pittsburgh on account of the flood. He now plans a meeting in that city on March 6, followed later in the spring by sectional meetings in Philadelphia, central Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

For District No. 4 (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia, and Virginia) I planned two regional meetings for this fall, but

¹ Excerpts will appear in the April *Bulletin*.

due to untoward circumstances it was found necessary to postpone them until next spring. One meeting was to have been held at the University of Virginia for the chapters in Virginia and the other meeting was to have been held in Washington for the chapters in the other states and in the District of Columbia.

Professor J. S. Guy, of Emory University, member of Committee E for District No. 5 (North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida), attempted to arouse interest in the work of the Association in several sections of his district by correspondence and personally visited the Georgia State College for Women at Milledgeville. This past fall, Professor Guy had hoped to arrange regional meetings in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Professor J. H. Kusner, member of the Council and president of the University of Florida chapter, arranged a joint meeting of the chapters of Florida State College for Women and the University of Florida for February 8 and 9 at Tallahassee.

Professor Harvey Walker, of Ohio State University, member of Committee E for District No. 6 (State of Ohio), is one of our most active members. Instead of arranging regional meetings in his district, he has repeated his effective work of former years by visiting the chapters and speaking at their meetings. On the last two days of February, Professor Walker undertook a trip to these institutions in northeastern Ohio: Baldwin-Wallace College, Case School of Applied Science, Hiram College, John Carroll University, Lake Erie College, Notre Dame College, Ursuline College, and Western Reserve University. On May 14 and 15, he visited Marietta College, Muskingum College, and Ohio University. In October he visited Antioch College, University of Cincinnati, Miami University, and Wittenberg College. In November he visited the chapters in northwestern Ohio at Ashland College, Kenyon College, Mount Union College, and College of Wooster.

Considerable activity has also occurred in District No. 7 (Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin) of which Professor C. L. Grose of Northwestern University is director. On January 18 a regional luncheon meeting was held at the Hamilton Club in Chicago, 103 persons being present (60 from Northwestern University, 21 from University of Chicago, five from Lake Forest College, four from Illinois State Normal University, and 13 from other institutions). It was a significant meeting because of the attendance of the President of the Association, the General Secretary, and three ex-Presidents. There were the following addresses: "What Is the American Association of University Professors?" by Professor R. E. Himstead, General Secretary; "Inside News from the Washington Office," by Professor W. W. Cook, former President and retiring General Secretary; "Effects of the Depression and Plans for Recovery in Institutions of Higher Learning," by Dean A. J. Harno, a

member of Committee Y; and "What May the American Association of University Professors Become?" by Professor A. J. Carlson, President of the Association. So successful was the meeting in Chicago that it was voted to make it an annual affair.

A regional meeting for the State of Wisconsin was held at Madison on the afternoon of May 2 with an attendance of 108, distributed as follows: University of Wisconsin, 90; Milwaukee Extension Division, 11; Milwaukee-Downer College, 2; Ripon College, 2; Marquette University, 1; Lawrence College, 1; Carroll College, 1. The speakers at the luncheon were President Frank of the University of Wisconsin, and Professor Carlson, President of our Association. A round-table discussion followed on the subject, "The Relation of the College Administration to Propagandizing of Student Groups."

A regional meeting of the Michigan chapters was held at Ann Arbor on November 7, and the Indiana chapters held a similar meeting on December 5.¹ In September various members from five state teachers colleges of Illinois held a meeting in Springfield, arranged by Professor Clarence L. Cross of the Illinois State Normal University. In addition to the activities related above, Professor Grose spoke on April 24 at a joint dinner meeting of the chapters of Illinois State Normal and Illinois Wesleyan Universities at Bloomington. About 55 persons were present, including the President of Illinois Wesleyan University. On May 16, Professor Grose conferred with members at Bradley Polytechnic Institute regarding an increase in membership there.

Professor Edward S. Allen, of Iowa State College, member of Committee E for District No. 9 (Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Province of Manitoba), has continued unabated his activity of previous years. In March, he made a trip to Minnesota, meeting on March 16 at dinner with faculty members of Carleton and St. Olaf Colleges at Northfield. The next day, Professor Allen conferred with Professor Willey at the University of Minnesota, offering assistance to Committee Y during his trip through District No. 9. A joint session of members of Hamline University and the College of St. Catherine was then held, Professor A. C. Krey, of Minnesota, a member of the Council, presiding. Professor Willey spoke at this meeting on the work of his committee, and Professor Allen also participated in the program. Professor Allen then went to St. Cloud where he conferred with a member about increasing the membership in the State Teachers College there. On the 18th, upon the invitation of the President of the institution, he visited the State Teachers College at Mankato, addressing a faculty meeting on the work and ideals of the Association. He also visited the faculty of Gustavus Adolphus College at St. Peter, inviting them to membership.

¹ Reported in February *Bulletin*, page 167.

On March 20, Professor Allen attended a meeting at the Central Missouri State Teachers College at Warrensburg. Professor Allen made a contact at Westminster College with a view to meeting the faculty there at some future date. At Jefferson City, he found the new chapter at Lincoln University a very active one. On March 22 in Springfield, he addressed a joint meeting of the chapters of the Southwest Missouri State Teachers College and Drury College, and then drove to Cape Girardeau where he spoke on March 23 at a faculty meeting of the Southeast Missouri State Teachers College at the invitation of the President, his subject being "Democracy and Education." A dinner meeting was also held, at which a lively discussion ensued.

On March 24, Professor Allen spoke at two meetings in St. Louis, the first at Harris Teachers College, the second at a dinner with members of the St. Louis University chapter. Professor Allen talked by telephone with members at Lindenwood College at St. Charles; he also visited Parsons College. His total mileage in District No. 9 during March was 2000.

On April 10, the Iowa Conference of University Professors was held at Des Moines. This conference is apparently going to be an annual affair as minutes of the previous meeting were kept and were read at this meeting. Representatives of the various chapters present reported briefly on their local activities. At the business session, Professor I. F. Neff of Drake University was elected chairman and Professor Allen secretary for the ensuing year. A motion was carried that the conference have a legislative representative, preferably a resident of Des Moines, to keep the chapters informed on the status of legislation influencing higher education in Iowa. Following the business session, the conference held a joint dinner meeting with the economic and sociological associations. Professor H. J. Gilkey of Iowa State College and Professor H. S. Conard of Grinnell College both representing the Iowa Conference of our Association, delivered addresses, the first on the subject of "Retirement Annuities in Colleges and Universities" and the second on "The Function of Faculties in University and College Government." The other speaker at the dinner meeting, Professor M. H. Hunter of the University of Illinois spoke on the subject of "Some Social and Economic Implications of Public Finance."

In concluding my report about activities in District No. 9, I wish to refer to an admirable three-page mimeographed statement that was prepared by the Iowa State College chapter, containing information about the practical advantages of membership in the Association. Designed primarily for the solicitation of members of the engineering faculty at that institution, I believe it could be used to advantage in attracting new members in other faculties as well; I recommend that if

any chapter is interested a communication be addressed to Professor Allen with a view to securing a copy of the statement.

We now move westward to District No. 10 (Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota) presided over by Professor D. A. Worcester, of the University of Nebraska. Besides carrying on correspondence with all the local chapters in his district, Professor Worcester organized a very successful regional meeting at the University of Nebraska on April 4. About 100 persons were in attendance at the conference, representing 13 institutions. The University of Nebraska gave a complimentary dinner to delegates arriving on Friday before the opening of the conference. Two sessions were held: one in the morning and the other at luncheon. Professor J. O. Hertzler of the University of Nebraska presided at the first session at which addresses were delivered by Professor P. Raymond Nielson of Creighton University on "Salary Scales;" Professor Guy B. Dolson of Nebraska Wesleyan University on "The Place of the American Association of University Professors in the Local Institution;" Professor A. J. Carlson of the University of Chicago on "The Function of the American Association of University Professors in American Education." At the luncheon meeting, over which Professor Worcester presided, Professor E. S. Allen of the Iowa State College spoke on the subject, "Chapter Activities and Problems." Following this address a discussion was led by Professors G. S. Fullbright of Washburn College and A. L. Keith of the University of South Dakota.

Professor H. L. Dodge, of the University of Oklahoma, member of Committee E for District No. 11 (Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas), spoke at a dinner meeting of the University of Tulsa Chapter in February. Professor Dodge's presence was desired by the chapter president to aid in the campaign for new members and to make the chapter a more active one. Professor Dodge has arranged for a regional meeting at Southwestern State Teachers College at San Marcos, Texas, with Professor G. E. Potter of Baylor University as the visiting speaker. A meeting of all the chapters of the State of Oklahoma is planned for next February at Tulsa in conjunction with the Oklahoma Educational Association. A visit by Professor Dodge or by Professor Richards of the national Council to the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College chapter was also planned at the invitation of the president of that chapter.

Professor Ralph H. Lutz, of Stanford University, member of Committee E for District No. 15 (Nevada and Northern California), reports that tentative plans have been made for holding a regional meeting in the San Francisco Bay area. To this meeting the chapter of the University of Nevada would be invited to send representatives.

Last March, Professor E. R. Hedrick, of the University of California

at Los Angeles, member of Committee E for District No. 16 (Southern California and Arizona), reported that he had traveled 100 miles to speak at a dinner given by the chapter at the University of Redlands. He also reported that he was communicating with the chapters in his district relative to possible regional meetings.

G. H. RYDEN, *Chairman*

THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF FACULTIES IN UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION¹

REPORT OF COMMITTEE T

During the autumn just past, Committee T has been engaged in a study of the internal organization of departments of instruction. In this report of progress it proposes to lay before a convention of the Association the results of this study and to solicit a discussion on the subject and the aid of the members, individually and by chapters, in perfecting its conclusions. The report should be understood as tentative, binding neither the Committee nor the Association; it is an effort to take counsel about a difficult phase of university government rather than to state definitive results. Members of the Association who are familiar with the report of the first Committee T, which drafted the original pronouncement of the Association on university government, will recall that the internal organization of departments was there described as the phase of the subject which was least capable of generalization and least suitable to be dealt with by legislative enactment. The existing Committee T at the convention of the Association last year reiterated this judgment. Reports made last year by the chapters showed that there was no perceptible trend in the organization of departments during the fifteen years that had elapsed since the publication of the first report. The difficulty of the problem remained much what it has been at any time during the last twenty years.

It was this fact which prompted the Committee to make the subject a preferred order of business this fall. The Committee has been dependent this year as last upon the good will of the chapters. The General Secretary of the Association circularized the chapters for us and we now have reports covering the practice of 118 institutions of all classes in which chapters exist. The Committee wishes to express its gratification at the interest so widely shown and its thanks for the help so generously rendered.

In its investigation the Committee had in view three chief purposes:

1. It wished to ascertain how far the prevalent forms of organization within departments were subject to serious abuses and the nature of the commonest abuses. This appeared to be a necessary preliminary to recommending improvements or indeed to determining whether improvements were needed or could be reasonably expected.

2. The Committee wished to ascertain how far universities had undertaken to legislate on the organization of departments by fixing in statutes the duties and powers of departmental executives. This question

¹ Presented at the Annual Meeting, December 28, 1936.

was of primary importance to the Committee, since its duty is to suggest measures that are capable of being enacted into the organic law of universities. There was from the start, moreover, a question in our minds how far the organization of departments was of this nature and how far the difficulties and abuses that exist were dependent upon factors of situation and personality that can not be reached by legislation.

3. The Committee wished to ascertain what types of organization were in use and what powers were commonly exercised by departments or their executive officers. Our thought here was that this information might be serviceable, even though it proved impossible to base general recommendations upon it. The organization of departments can be seen *a priori* to be a matter upon which wide variation of practice is inevitable and justifiable. The size and nature of institutions, the size and composition of departments, and probably even differences between subjects of instruction are all relevant to the making of a good working organization. Prudence would dictate great caution in making general statements on the subject, yet a knowledge of the types of organization in use might suggest to persons concerned in a difficult situation some way of improving it.

1. *The Extent and Nature of Abuses.*—On the whole the Committee is disposed to be gratified by the showing of our correspondents relative to the occurrence of serious abuses of authority by the heads of departments. To the inquiry whether such abuses were known, 75 out of 118 answer "No" categorically, four others state that there are at present no serious abuses though some have occurred in the past, and seven others report that abuses, though they exist, are not serious or of very general occurrence. Among the 118 replies we estimate that there are about 20 (or one in six) in which abuses of authority are reported that our correspondents regard as really serious, and a number of these qualify their answers by saying that the occurrences are sporadic or occasional or concern a single person or case. Considering the possibilities that exist, we are not inclined to regard this as a bad showing for the universities as a class, though this in no way condones the bad cases that undoubtedly occur.

The nature of the abuses reported is about what might have been anticipated: they center in the unwillingness of department heads to deal fairly with other members of the department or in an inclination to make decisions without conference. In some cases, it must be admitted, the complaints are of a rather subjective nature and it can not be assumed that the judgment of our correspondents would always be shared by all or even a majority of their colleagues. "Favoritism," "undue influence" on younger teachers or students, "interference" with other men's work, or even "selfishness" in taking the best courses or

lightest load are all genuine abuses when they indubitably occur, but it is not so easy to tell whether what occurs really merits that description. On the other hand, some charges are quite objective and capable of being substantiated. The head of a department who changes a grade given in another teacher's course, or who moves in a case of dismissal without making a careful investigation of the facts, is obviously guilty of a gross infraction of the freedom of teaching and permanence of tenure. A department head who habitually exercises his authority in an autocratic way, without consultation and discussion, or who extends his authority into the classrooms of colleagues with approximately equal scholarly standing, or who substitutes authority for consultation and advice when dealing even with much less experienced colleagues, has at least no just conception of the relation that should exist in a community of scholars.

Unfortunately your Committee knows of no way in which the conception of a community of scholars can be inculcated by legislation. We believe that our correspondents almost universally regard the abuses which they report as a consequence of the personal characteristics of the offenders. As one writer sagely remarks, a man who is a stickler for democratic government in universities in the abstract may be anything but democratic in his concrete dealings with the colleagues who are closest to him. We are not able to discover from the reports that there is any correlation whatever between the abuse of authority by department heads and the various kinds of institutions from which the reports come. They occur in large universities and small colleges, in old and in new institutions, in institutions that are state-supported and privately endowed, in places that are wholly or mainly colleges of liberal arts and in those that include or are mainly professional schools. Even the nature of the departmental organization does not appear to be strictly relevant to the occurrence of unfair practices. A correspondent in one of the relatively few institutions where no department heads exist but where departments are administered by the senior professors acting as a committee reports that the younger men are obliged to carry more than their fair share of the teaching load. Consequently we are obliged to conclude that the essential problem is one of personalities that can not be met by legislation.

What can be said with confidence is that neither serious abuses nor the suspicion of abuses occurs in departments where the responsible executive officers, whatever their legal powers, habitually consult their colleagues, regard the work of the department as a joint enterprise in teaching and research, permit its interests and its problems to be known and discussed, and exercise even a great authority with consideration and a regard for the ideas of all concerned. The advantage to an insti-

tution at large of this kind of spirit ought to be as obvious to administrative officers as to teachers. There is at least one interesting report of a college in which the practice of holding departmental conferences has come about at the insistence of a dean. In general the functioning of a departmental organization can not be altogether separated from the relation in which department heads stand to the dean and the president.

2. *The Utility of Legislation.*—Doubtless for the reasons just indicated the attempt to settle the power of departments and of department heads by statute has been relatively rare. In only 20 of the 118 institutions reporting do there appear to be any written regulations on the subject. Even in these cases there is not always an effort to fix a form of government within the department but rather to set it up as a unit of instruction within the university and to fix its responsibility relative to the higher administrative officers. In the great majority of cases the administrative organization of departments is undefined and follows lines prescribed by custom or determined by the delegation of power from deans and presidents.

Like other administrative officers the head of a department stands in a twofold relation, to the members of his own department on the one hand and to the dean of his college or the president of the university on the other. In a plan of university government conceived from an administrative point of view, the second is more likely to be stressed than the first. This need not imply a desire to lodge great power in the department head or even the actual exercise of such power. For administrative purposes it is simpler that one person should take the final responsibility in preparing a budget for a department, in representing a department's needs, and in formulating a conception of what a department's offerings should be. A dean or a president is usually compelled to rely on someone in the department for information on these subjects and also on the competence and efficiency with which the work of instruction or research is conducted. From his point of view it is at least easier to have these responsibilities placed definitely upon a single person. Some statutes have therefore been drawn with this end chiefly in view. To quote a single example: "There shall be in each department an officer known as the Head or Chairman of the Department whose duty it shall be to supervise the work of the Department, to see that the teaching is satisfactory, and to give to the Dean or President prompt information of any matters that should come to his attention." From the point of view of the departments and of the teachers in them it is clearly preferable that such supervision should be exercised in the department rather than by a dean who is outside it.

On the other hand some statutes appear to have been drawn mainly with the purpose of regulating the internal organization of departments

and sometimes specifically with a view to securing the right of all members to participate in its deliberations. An example may be found in the Statutes of Columbia University: "Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, associates, and instructors shall be entitled to vote in regard to matters under consideration by a department. Unless otherwise ordered by the Trustees, the senior officer of the highest rank who is in active service in any department shall be its executive officer."

The Committee questions whether it is universally desirable to define the organization of departments by statute. Our doubt is due especially to the great variability in the size of universities and even of departments within a single university. One chapter which has sent us an unusually careful report, and which is in an institution where the government of departments appears to be highly democratic, attributes this in part to an absence of rules and to the constant occurrence of quite informal conference. The Committee is prepared at least to entertain the hypothesis that in such an institution the requirement that departments should meet formally and settle their problems by vote might have the effect of diminishing informal conferences, with bad consequences rather than good.

On the other hand, in large departments where conferences do not take place spontaneously, the Committee believes that departmental meetings for discussion and voting ought to occur and that a statute drawn upon the lines of that at Columbia is valuable. At least it is clear that a university which proposes to adopt any statutory provision dealing with the executive officers of its departments ought not to envisage these officers exclusively in the relation of responsibility in which they stand to deans and presidents. Such a statute should be drawn to safeguard also the settlement of policies by conferences in which the members of the department participate as of right.

3. *The Organization of Departments.*—In respect to their formal organization departments of instruction in American universities follow a single type in a surprisingly large number of cases. Of the 118 institutions for which the Committee has reports, 108 regularly have their departments administered by a single department head or chairman designated by the administration of the university. In nearly all cases the head's tenure is indefinite or at the pleasure of the president. In a few cases there is a limited term of appointment, from one to three years, but even here the practice of reappointment for term after term appears to be common. Among the institutions listed here there are a few in which the practice may not be quite universal throughout the university; a department or two for some unusual reason may have some other kind of organization but this is clearly exceptional. It

should be said further that half of these institutions are of such a sort that departments are characteristically small, containing usually a single professor who is naturally marked out by seniority for the position of head. The other half, however, include universities in which there must be many large departments. Hence the uniformity is striking.

With reference to the authority of these appointed and practically permanent heads, it can be said with certainty that they usually possess more power than the great majority of them undertake to wield. Because the powers are as a rule not defined, it is often hard to say exactly what they are, but since the head of the department is commonly conceived to be responsible to the administration for budget, planning courses, and the quality of instruction—in short, for the general policy of the department—it seems to be somewhat vaguely taken for granted in many institutions that he has authority to act in all these particulars. On the other hand, it is clear that the actual exercise of a power so extensive is rare. Thus of institutions where departments are organized under a permanent appointed head 45 report that the policies of departments are regularly settled in meetings or by conferences, and an equal number report that the practice varies according to the inclination of the person in charge. In this latter group of cases, since abuses of authority appear not to be unusually frequent, we infer that the department head who arrogates to himself the right to decide on policies for the whole department is comparatively rare. Nevertheless he does exist in far too many departments. In nine institutions our correspondents report that it is common practice for policies to be settled for departments either by the head or by the head and the dean. By and large the answers to this question confirm what was said above about abuses of authority, namely, that the actual working of departments as distinguished from the legal powers of their executive officers, depends very largely on the personality of the man at the head.

In order to determine more precisely the way in which heads of departments use their authority, the Committee investigated three important divisions of administrative action: (a) the recommendation of appointments, promotions, and dismissals; (b) the laying out of the schedule of courses to be given in the department; (c) the planning and management of instruction in the courses. In general terms the results may be summarized as follows:

(a) In the first case (appointments, etc.) it is normal that action should require the recommendation of the head of the department. It would of course not follow that his recommendation would become effective, but it appears that a department head could normally prevent action by refusing to recommend it. The control of a department head over his budget seems to be stronger than his control over educational

affairs; at least, the consultation of other members of the department is reported to be much less frequent in respect to promotions and the like than in respect to the planning of courses.

(b) In the second case (the laying out of a schedule of courses) the consultation of a head with other members of the department is reported as normal in about three-fifths of the institutions. Here again heads of departments differ. In 14 institutions it is said to be normal practice for the head to plan the offerings of the department entirely or subject to the control of the dean, but these are probably for the most part departments where there is a single teacher of full professorial rank. Even in such cases, however, it is improbable that such an assumption of authority is usually wise.

(c) In the third case (the direction of teaching within courses) the assumption of authority by the head of a department is relatively rare. In about three-fifths of the institutions reporting it is said definitely not to occur and in most of the others it is not usual though it occasionally happens. The situation is somewhat complicated in large schools where an elementary class may meet in many sections and where some unity of direction is necessary. In eight institutions, however, it is reported to be normal practice for department heads to try more or less to direct the work in all courses, a procedure which we should suppose to be justifiable only on the assumption that the rest of the faculty is incompetent.

On the whole, however, we believe the principle to be pretty generally recognized that a teacher should be free to conduct his classes in his own way. Violations of the principle arise usually where department heads or senior teachers are innately the kind of persons who can not help interfering. Perhaps it is not amiss to record the opinion that this freedom of teaching is not an indefensible natural right. It implies an obligation on the teacher's part to fit his work into some rational plan of departmental instruction and on a department's part to plan its courses with reference to the whole educational policy of the institution to which it belongs.

The fact that a single type of departmental organization—the single appointed head on practically permanent tenure—is so common makes it more imperative, for the purposes of this report, to put some emphasis upon other types, though they are represented only infrequently. All these vary in the direction of regarding the department collectively as an autonomous unit and of depressing correspondingly the authority and the responsibility of a designated head. It is not easy, however, to distinguish the efforts in this direction into different types of organization.

Perhaps the smallest departure from the prevailing type arises when

the headship, though remaining appointive, is regularly rotated among several members of the department. This occurs, for example, in some departments at Vassar. The main difference that this change might be expected to make would lie in preventing the power of the head from becoming a vested authority.

A greater departure from the prevailing type occurs when the head or chairman of a department is elected by its members. This has become the practice in certain departments at a fairly large number of institutions, such as Amherst, Columbia, Cornell, Minnesota, Smith, Vassar, and in one college at Pittsburgh. As a rule such a department chairman is elected for a term rather than in perpetuity and very often it seems to be the practice to rotate the office. In this form of organization it becomes practically necessary for some part of a department, such as the men of higher rank or senior tenure, to act in a special and perhaps extra-legal capacity for particular purposes. For obvious reasons it would be embarrassing and perhaps not usually expedient to throw all questions of promotion and salary increase into the general meeting of a large department.

Not sharply distinguished from the preceding type of organization is that in which the chairman is merely the presiding officer of a committee, composed of the members of the department having full professorial rank. Here the committee itself, rather than its chairman, is the governing body of the department. This form of organization exists at Wesleyan University and the University of Texas and substantially in some departments at Cornell University.

It would certainly be saying too much to claim that these more democratic forms of departmental organization always work perfectly. They do insure conference and they prevent the occurrence of serious abuses such as those that happen in departments that are autocratically governed in fact as well as in name. Departments that are democratically governed are not necessarily better governed than departments in which a head is wise enough not to use all his power, but they are not often badly governed. It is conceivable that the government of a department by a committee might become lax or cumbersome, but the inconvenience would not be greater than that caused by an autocratic head.

In conclusion the Committee points with some satisfaction to the fact that a number of universities, especially among the larger ones, have ceased to force all their departments into a single mold of organization. At Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, Minnesota, Mount Holyoke, and Pittsburgh—and probably at other institutions—the form of organization varies from department to department or from school to school. In view of the difficulty of improving the government of de-

partments by legislation, this appears to be wise practice. Your Committee feels that a certain lack of imagination is evidenced by the very general prevalence of a single type of departmental organization. Departments within the same institutions may vary widely in a number of respects that are relevant to their internal organization. This fact ought to be recognized and in any case universities ought to be willing to experiment with different types of organization. The existence in a university of even a few departments with elective heads would probably tend to affect the administration of all departments.

G. H. SABINE, *Chairman*

Addendum

Extract from a letter by a member of the Committee, J. W. Woodard of Temple University, received by the Chairman too late for modification of the report: "... It is true that the matter of departments is in some sense a minor one; true that it is one of the most difficult to get at by legislation on the matter; true that many departments have as desirable a set-up as could be asked; and true that most department heads do not use all the power which they technically have. It is, however, also true that the method of rotating chairmanships instead of headships of a permanent nature so combine the needs of the administration (for a single personal contact and point of major responsibility) and the demands of the department members (for assurance of a democratic participation in shaping departmental policies and for assurance against discriminative abuse of power by the department head), as well as the demands of broad educational policy (for assurance of flexibility, range, and depth such as a single man can not always provide)—that, in my opinion, the rotating chairman form deserves to be more strongly recommended. Indeed, it should be put forward as the desirable form of departmental organization wherever a department has as many as two or three ranking members." The writer proceeds to develop the argument by citation of more or less typical cases. The matter will presumably have further attention by the Committee during the current year.

TEACHERS' LOYALTY OATHS¹

It is said frequently that the teachers occupy a position of such transcendent importance because of the influence of education that they ought to be singled out by a measure designed to protect our youth from disloyalty and distorted ideas. If the influence of a group is the determining factor in this question of loyalty then the ministers of the various churches, the editors and publishers of newspapers and periodicals, the directors of the screen, and all parents and guardians should be compelled to swear a loyalty oath along with the teacher for their influence upon youth is of equal weight with and sometimes of greater weight than that of the teacher. In fact the lawyer or the doctor in close contact with his client can have a greater effect upon the ideas and ideals of the client than any one else in the world. No, the teachers are not the only specially influential group nor is the college or school the only important educational process. All of this goes to show that the singling out of teachers is unfair and unjust discrimination. In this characteristic of loyalty oath statutes, the whole affair is distinctly un-American.

A second objection to teacher loyalty oaths is the fact that in this manner the conscience of the state is substituted for the conscience of the teacher. The teacher is the very heart of the educational process of school or college. Education depends upon the teacher. The results of education in ideals and moral principles as well as in scholarship and academic attainment rest upon the teacher. If the teacher fails, the whole educational process collapses. If the teacher is untrustworthy, education will be a failure. There is no hope for education or for any helpful or wholesome result from education except in that the teacher can give education purpose, meaning, and integrity.

There is only one way to make a teacher trustworthy and that is to believe in his trustworthiness, to place confidence in his character. If the teacher is trusted, his conscience will keep him loyal to the state. If the conscience of the state is substituted for the conscience of the teacher, the greatest hope and the surest reason for loyalty and intelligent service are removed. When a state resolves to determine a teacher's fitness to teach by a loyalty oath, it is substituting its own conscience for that of the teacher. This destroys delicate and fine self-respect and the sense of responsibility. This is the harm in all legislation which regulates teaching in the realm of truth and ideals.

A third argument against teacher loyalty oaths is that they do not actually eliminate the dishonest and disloyal teacher, while they cast reflection upon the teachers of fine ideals who have deep feeling of obligations toward their state. If a teacher is disloyal to his country and is dishonest enough to want to teach though being disloyal, he would not

¹ Excerpts from an article by the President of the University of Chattanooga, in the *Chattanooga Sunday Times*, December 6, 1938.

hesitate one moment in taking any sort of oath. There have been no disloyal teachers, as far as the writer knows, with all the oaths of allegiance that are being sworn, removed from office by failure or refusal to take the oath of office or the pledge of allegiance. Thus an attempt to guarantee loyalty through law is ineffective and in its moral effect upon the loyal teachers often positively harmful.

One of the most potent reasons which annul any merit in teacher loyalty oaths is the placing of emphasis at the wrong point and the destroying of effective effort where effort is needed. Because of this misplaced emphasis teacher loyalty oaths are a misdirection of energy, time, and thought to no useful purpose and a failure to direct attention to the proper place. There are influences in this country subversive of democracy. They exist in those conditions of society and government which tend to undermine any nation and any civilization. To alter or eliminate these conditions is to preserve democracy. To name several of the conditions inimical to democracy: destruction of natural resources, especially land, political indifference, social irresponsibility, the spoils system in government, wasteful and inefficient government, unemployment, violence on the part of employees, injustice on the part of employers, the slums which breed ignorance and vice, failure to control crime and, therefore, to protect life and property, defects in administration of justice. These conditions and others like them are subversive of democracy. In them, not in the teachers, lie the dangers of communism or fascism.

Powerful organizations and individuals should direct their energies towards the elimination of these evils if they would serve democracy. Generally speaking, to press for teacher loyalty oaths is to neglect the real dangers. It seems to be a part of human nature that to work toward one end minimizes effort toward another end. One of the worst misfortunes following upon the attempt to pass teacher loyalty oaths is to raise a smoke cloud that obscures or obliterates the real ills we need to fear.

In the whole question of having education serve and preserve democracy the important problem is to maintain a school or a school system of merit and fine ideals, the influence of which is conducive to effective and loyal citizenship. The merit of a school or a school system depends upon two qualities, professional administration and adequate financial support. It is very disappointing to see groups and individuals seeking to save democracy from the dangers which may come from education by passing teacher loyalty oaths when the groups and individuals so concerned have never given education any serious thought or study and have never actually fought one battle for professional administration or adequate financial support. A politically administered school or school

system and a school system starved of the necessary resources are dangers to democracy. Enacting into law the requirement of an oath of allegiance seems so meaningless and so futile when our schools are crying for adequate support and for professional administration.

Finally, the teacher loyalty oaths that have been passed are often so dangerous in their implications or so ambiguous in their meaning that they are in themselves proof against the advisability of the loyalty oath statute for teachers.

For example, the Massachusetts law reads, "I do solemnly swear that I will support the constitution of the United States of America and the constitution of the commonwealth of Massachusetts and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of my position according to the best of my ability." Let us examine the words "discharge the duties of my position." Who is to determine the obligations of the office of a teacher or whether or not he fulfills the duties of his position? Will the state legislature determine the obligation of a teacher or the state board of education in the case of a public school teacher? Will the state legislature determine the obligations of the teacher or the president and board of overseers of Harvard University in the case of a member of the Harvard faculty? To whom is the teacher in Massachusetts responsible? Is he responsible to the state legislature or to the board of education or to the board of overseers of Harvard University if he is a teacher at Harvard? Does and can the teacher in Massachusetts know to whom or to what agency he is responsible? If the state and the board of trustees of Harvard University or the state board of education differ in their interpretation of whether or not the teacher discharges his duties, the teacher is in a hopeless dilemma, and competent and gifted instruction and fine academic attainment are placed in jeopardy.

The Georgia law requires teachers to swear to refrain from directly or indirectly subscribing to or teaching any theory of government or economics or of social relations "which is inconsistent with the fundamental principle of patriotism and high ideals of Americanism." This is something of a blanket order. What economics or social relations are inconsistent with the high ideals of Americanism and who is to say whether or not a teacher is teaching social relations or economics inconsistent with Americanism?

Here is a club that any person may raise to strike down a teacher. A principal dismisses a pupil or an instructor fails to pass a student. The irate parent powerful in political organization can invoke the teacher's pledge, especially if the principal or teacher holds any ideas at variance from those held by the majority of the locality, and drive the teacher from his profession. A demagogue or a fanatic sees some cause for action in the remarks of a teacher. They are an evidence of teaching

social relations contrary to Americanism. The flames of prejudice are fanned. The teacher is dishonored and punished.

A strong barrier against the evils of communism is an understanding of what communism is and of the cruelties which have been carried on under that régime. Knowledge of communism and of its false political and economic philosophies is a great protection against communism in America. Is giving or allowing an understanding and knowledge of communism teaching communism? Who knows? The Washington school system is in confusion even as to the publications which might be read, actually prohibiting the circulation of a reputable magazine containing a factual article about communism. So the teacher lives and works in uncertainty and often in fear.

One often hears these remarks: "The president of the United States takes an oath of office, the governors of states, the elected representatives of the people, the judges and others take an oath of office. If men in such high office pledge support of the constitution and allegiance to the flag, why not teachers also? What is the objection to the teachers' oath?" There is no objection, of course, to an oath of allegiance itself. As has been stated, the objection is to the reason and cause which prompt the teacher loyalty statutes, to the manner and kind of such legislation, and to the results therefrom.

There is something else, however, of great importance to be said on this particular question. As a rule, those who have been required traditionally to swear an oath of loyalty to the constitution have been those who had in their hands, because of their executive, legislative, or judicial capacity, the keeping of the constitution itself, those who are charged with executing the laws under the constitution, who are responsible for life, liberty, and property according to the provisions of the constitution. For them the constitution is the guide and control of their legislative, executive, and judicial functions carried on every day under the articles of the constitution. The constitution and the rights and liberties of the people under the constitution are specifically in their keeping.

The relation of these groups to the preservation of the constitution and the rights and privileges guaranteed by the constitution is very special. The oath of office for these groups has, and always has had, therefore, a very particular and deep significance. It is a real question and certainly a debatable question whether or not any particular significance will be attached to the act of compelling hosts of people with no such direct responsibility for the rights and liberties of all citizens under the constitution to take oaths of allegiance. May not the compelling of a great number of people with no such responsibility to take the loyalty oath destroy or at least detract from the significance of the customary and established oath of office for certain, particularly responsible public officials?

As a matter of fact, every citizen of the United States is under the obligation of allegiance and loyalty to the flag, country, and constitution. He is under this obligation whether or not he swears an oath of loyalty. Swearing an oath places him under no greater obligation of loyalty; failure to swear an oath removes not one single dot from his duty of loyalty and allegiance to his country. But if great groups of citizens are to have their loyalty made evident by some formal pledge, then in the course of time the responsibility and trust of citizenship will not be an implied and accepted obligation, but only an obligation made real by an oath. For this reason, in the course of time, it will be necessary to have all citizens swear an oath since implied and accepted obligation will be destroyed. Then it will be realized that a general oath for all citizens will not be as certain a surety of loyalty as the implied trust and obligation of citizenship.

ALEXANDER GUERRY

THE AMERICAN LEGION AND THE SCHOOLS

From an address before the National Education Association, Portland, Oregon, July 2, 1936, by Frank Miles, editor of the *Iowa Legionnaire*, who represented the National Commander, Roy Murphy, is quoted the following:

"Educators are the strongest group in America intellectually, but in my judgment they are the weakest politically for their number. I know what they are up against in many localities, but they can succeed in enlisting more lay cooperation to obtain for the schools what they deserve in appropriations if they will proceed tactfully. The American Legion is at their command in such worthy endeavor under mandate of three consecutive national conventions.

"Tremendous efforts have been, and are being made, to deceive educators into thinking that we are trying to militarize the schools and make goose-steppers of the children for another war. Our great practical peace movement, the Universal Draft Bill, is being fought on the one side by the capitalists who want opportunities to profiteer in war time unhampered, and on the other by the communists who do not want the government to have what they say would be too much authority over the individual. Our capitalistic opposition calls it communistic; our communistic opposition calls it capitalistic; and both warn educators against us.

"Most often repeated charge is that the Legion is trying to tell the school teachers what to teach, that we are trying to curb academic freedom. May I assure you that although once in a while a post, or an individual Legionnaire, may object to something or other in a school, that the Legion is interested chiefly in helping teach children how to think....

"In 1934, at our Miami convention, the Legion adopted a resolution calling on the legislature of every state to enact a law which would require teachers therein to take an oath to support the national and state constitutions. The resolution was not repeated at our convention at St. Louis, in 1935, and is, therefore, not now in effect.

"Our National Commander has authorized me to say that, while he thinks the American Legion, and any other American organization, should take the necessary legal action to stop the teaching of subversive doctrines in American school rooms, if such teaching should exist, he believes the Legion would make a mistake if it advocated the teachers' oath bill."

REVIEWS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

Higher Education and Society: A Symposium, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936; 323 pp., \$3.00.

Cooperation. Integration. The social objects and functions of higher education. These are the dominant notes sounding through papers read at the Southwestern Conference on Higher Education held in celebration of the tenth year of William Bennett Bizzell's presidency of the University of Oklahoma.

The topic of this regional conference being Higher Education and Society, the papers were planned to present the picture of a university's relations and obligations to the social order in which it finds itself, especially that of the region in which the university is native. To a rather exceptional degree the papers carry out this idea logically and completely, under a grouping which considers first the general relation of higher education to society and the general provinces and organization of higher education, then the contributions that the university may make in specific fields—control of physical environment, control of social environment, training of the social technician, the creative arts. A final section rounds out the discussion with a consideration of how the university may build toward the society of tomorrow.

A sense of the fundamental idea of the whole volume—that the university has rich opportunities for helping the growth of a better society, that there is much that it can *do*—may perhaps be conveyed by a paragraph from the eloquent paper by Frank Ernest Hill on "The Philosophy of American Culture" (which is well worth reading):

"There are materials here for a great culture. To a large extent they have been imposed upon us. We were given an earth which is not only fabulously rich in soil, forest, and mineral, but which is unmistakably different from that of other lands. Its hickories, its corn and tobacco, its whippoorwills and hermit thrushes, its all but vanished beaver, buffalo, and eagles, its rushing winds and rains, its brilliant sun, its Mississippi, Colorado, Mohave, and Superior make it a tremendous, varied, and beautiful if violent land. It is fit to carry proud homes, to produce great paintings and strong cities, to be sung of proudly. It is ours to work with today."

"It is ours to work with today." That is the keynote of the volume.

Details of ways in which the university may "work with" the world about it are well given in the sectional considerations of physical environment, social environment, and the creative arts. Horace J. Harper and George R. Phillips, for example, tell what is being done, what might and

should be done in training students to appreciate and work for the conservation of the country's physical resources. William F. Ogburn outlines some of the more important social changes, concluding, "If some of these influences are not desired, then it is up to us to prevent them. Likewise we may encourage the desirable trends. The future belongs to education." Cortez Ewing, writing of preparation for public service, expresses the thought that when, in this transition period, the national government challenges the universities to accept the responsibility of preparing public servants for their careers, the universities should accept that challenge and seriously seek to perform the desired function. There are several chapters on university training of social workers and economists and on health education and consumers' education. Six papers explain what universities are doing and can do to encourage the creative arts. In the first of the six John Gould Fletcher, under the title "Education for Living," brings together the reasons for university concern with the arts. He says, for instance:

"Education is for living. Education is for the good life. It should help us to live and to look with tolerance and with understanding on those who live near to us. It should help us also to think on what we are and on what life is when compared with eternity. If it does not do these two things, then it is not education. If it fails to interpret life, if it gives us merely facts about life, most of which are useless and can be found in any textbook, then it is not education at all."

The general introductory section contains some material of great interest. President Bizzell reviews the history and status of different types of education in the Southwest; he finds that institutions are responding to the functional demands of society, that the times are demanding a synthesis of subject matter and departments, also a development of techniques in the social sciences similar to those in the natural sciences. W. H. Cowley, writing of the "Significance of Student Traditions," shows what powerful but informal educational processes are inherent in the communal life of students. Radoslav A. Tsanoff, in a meaningful paper on "Intellectual Training and Moral Advance," seeks the fundamental and final contribution of higher education to human well-being; he finds that the correlation of knowledge is "one of the most promising trends in contemporary thought, for it is the path to wisdom. . . ." This is the wisdom of which Matthew Arnold spoke: "To see life steadily and see it whole." A paper by Homer L. Dodge, giving the results of a survey of "Graduate Study in the Southwest," full of significant facts and figures, emphasizes the need for cooperation between institutions: "Cooperation must come as a natural result of our desire to accomplish things which can be done better together than alone."

In the concluding section, which points toward the future, Ernest W. Marland, after considering the functions of government in building the society of tomorrow, urges that all those interested in vitalizing the program of higher education and believing that we *can* have better government, do all they can to see to it that higher education takes a *positive* position in regard to the improvement of government. Another paper points out the increasing demands upon college graduates for collective wisdom and powers of adjustment and the consequent duty devolving upon universities to provide for adult learning. Lotus D. Coffman brings the conference to a close by giving his conception of the purpose and duties of a university. Here recognition is given to the fact that the view of a university as a living thing, in close and constant contact with the world it is supposed to serve, is only one of two conceptions of a university in the world today; the other view, represented by the British and Scottish universities, is expressed in the words of Sir James Irvine: "The essential function of a university is to train the mind, and that type of disinterested study which has stood the test of time in the ancient universities is best suited to nourish the growing intellect.... A university is responsible for enlarging the boundaries of knowledge rather than for colonizing the territory it explores."

The symposium successfully shows the university—the university according to the first conception, that of the American state institution—in present and future dynamic relation to the society in which it lives. Fact and theory are blended in fair proportion. The total effect of the volume is to cause the reader to feel alert, receptive to change, conscious of possibilities. And who will say that this is not good?

KATHRYN McHALE

REFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION

The Higher Learning in America, Robert M. Hutchins; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936; 119 pp., \$2.00.

This widely discussed broadside is difficult to review fairly and constructively, partly because it is impossible to divine whether Dr. Hutchins expects to be taken literally in his main contentions and because he has chosen to reduce his well-known laconic style to still greater brevity. Granted that this brevity is marked by the trenchancy we expect from the author: a sweeping indictment of higher education and a revolutionary program of reform should be more than a syllabus of assertions. Dogmatism, when couched in caustic or witty phrase, may accomplish the aim of provoking discussion. It will not shape convictions which will work change unless supported by evidence which carries conviction. Nor can change—in this instance a drastic reorganization of higher

education—be wrought merely by offering a bare formula of a curriculum composed of “first principles” or a “hierarchy of truths.”

For Dr. Hutchins higher education is a “chaos,” faced with three “dilemmas.” First, the dilemma of “professionalism,” by which he means that professional training at present is merely vocational. “The practices of the profession change so rapidly that an attempt to inculcate them may merely succeed in teaching the student habits that will be a disservice to him when he graduates. . . . What has he acquired in the professional school that could not be better learned elsewhere? . . . Only in medicine do we find the actual conditions of practice on the university campus. . . . The student learns to practice in the only way in which anybody can learn to practice anything, by practicing.”

“Professionalism produces our second dilemma, which is the dilemma of isolation. To the extent to which professors are concerned with preparation for a specific trade they are isolated from professors interested in another specific trade, and both groups are isolated from those who are not interested in any trade at all but are attempting to pursue the truth for its own sake. . . . But neither the students nor the professors know what is the relation of one departmental truth to another, or what the relation of departmental truths to those in the domain of another department may be.”

“The third dilemma is that of anti-intellectualism. . . . Nowhere does insistence on intellectual problems as the only problems worthy of a university’s consideration meet such opposition as in the universities themselves. . . . The result is a course of study which is anti-intellectual from beginning to end.”

Responsibility for this sorry condition is ascribed to the love of money, a misconception of democracy, and an erroneous notion of progress. “The more information, the more discoveries, the more inventions, the more progress. The way to promote progress was therefore to get more information. The sciences one by one broke off from philosophy and then from one another, and that process is still going on. At last the whole structure of the university collapsed and the final victory of empiricism was won when the social sciences, law, and even philosophy and theology themselves became empirical and experimental and progressive. . . . Thus the modern temper produces that strangest of modern phenomena, an anti-intellectual university.”

So, to rescue the university from this disintegrating influence, Dr. Hutchins proposes a curriculum built around metaphysics, as represented, for example, in certain classics like Plato and Aristotle. “If we can revitalize metaphysics and restore it to its place in the higher learning, we may be able to establish rational order in the modern world as well as in the universities.” The other fields admitted to this scheme

are the social sciences and natural science, dependent on and subordinate to metaphysics or "first principles." The rest of the revolution is astonishingly simple: "The departmental system, which has done so much to obstruct the advancement of education and the advancement of knowledge, will vanish. The three faculties will constitute the entire organization of the university. Members of existing departments who are exclusively concerned either with data collecting or vocational training will be transferred to research or technical institutes." Then, "the professional schools of the university would disappear as such." Techniques of the several professions would be learned at "institutes"—the nature of which is not disclosed. So "the dilemmas of the higher learning are resolved."

Obvious criticism, theoretical and practical, of this reconstruction will rise to the mind of any reader conversant with the problems both of knowledge and of education, as indeed such criticism has not been lacking. Certain fundamental objections have been quoted previously in the *Bulletin*¹ and need not be repeated here, but certain particular assertions of Dr. Hutchins call for protest. The description, "A substantial part of what we call the social sciences is large chunks of such data, undigested, unrelated, and meaningless," is an unfortunate travesty of the truth. Likewise irresponsible seem the ridicule of the "great man" values in education as worthless and the reference to "those over-dressed hoydens, the modern versions of the natural and social sciences."

As to sweeping reforms in general, the reminder of President Angell in his last Annual Report is especially apposite: "...there is something very deep and enduring in the national pattern of education which yields reluctantly to merely bright ideas when these touch the underlying foundations on which institutions rest. Almost any experienced scholar could propose changes in our procedure which, if one were free to start anew, would promise much better results than we now achieve; but, unless such changes have their roots well down in national and institutional history, they are not likely to exercise any considerable and enduring influence."

P. K.

Newer Aspects of Collegiate Education, by Kathryn McHale and Frances V. Speek; Washington: American Association of University Women, 1936; 67 pp., \$0.50.

This outline guide for the study of trends in higher education includes concise summaries on rising enrolments, changes in admission requirements, student guidance, curriculum developments, new plans for accrediting, professional preparation in the arts college, and the extension

¹ February, 1937, pp. 164-165.

of college influence through alumni, adult, and extramural education. References to important sources are provided for each subject and at the end of the pamphlet is assembled a detailed list of the most-used sources.

This recent addition to the Education Series of the A. A. U. W. should be widely helpful to individuals or groups seeking orientation in this general field.

THE SOCIAL OUTLOOK OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

The Campus and Social Ideals, Harold S. Tuttle; New York: Published by the author, 1936; 87 pp.; cloth, \$1.50; paper, \$0.85.

Does the liberal arts college improve the character, the altruism, the social-mindedness of its students? Practically every college in the land makes such a claim. Thousands of books and articles have been written to substantiate it. But the experimental evidence is extremely meager.

This was the problem which Dr. Tuttle, of the College of the City of New York, set himself to investigate in four representative colleges. A series of tests was devised which ostensibly called for the application of civic knowledge, but which revealed the attitude of the student to a number of important social questions. Two equivalent forms of this test were given, one at the beginning, the other at the end of the freshman year, and on the basis of the results gains in social-mindedness were computed.

In an independent study information was collected from each student regarding his participation in extra-curricular activities, his economic status, his participation in college athletics, his reading of periodicals, his vocational aims, and his own judgment of the effect of college training on his social attitudes. Various other information regarding each student was secured from the registrar's office. Statistical computations were made to determine the amount of gains in social-mindedness and the influences that were most potent in producing these gains.

The mean gains for the four colleges ranged from 23 to 44 points. The factors that seemed most significantly correlated with these gains were the reading of progressive periodicals, working one's way through college, and the influence of certain instructors. More important than the numerical findings of the study is the fact that the author has devised a technique for measuring changes in social attitudes, and has shown that objectively valid results may be obtained by it. What is needed now is a more extensive study, based on a larger number of colleges, and carried on over a longer interval of time.

J. C. BELL

SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS AT HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

Scholarship and Fellowships Available at Institutions of Higher Education, Ella B. Ratcliffe; Washington: U. S. Office of Education, 1936; 117 pp., \$0.15.

This is a pamphlet of 115 pages, revising a similar bulletin in 1931. The tables are based on replies from 674 institutions, of which 288 reported that they granted neither scholarships nor fellowships. In many of these and in those which did not report at all there is little or no charge for tuition. Part I is a statistical summary showing the total number of scholarships, 66,708, amounting to nearly nine million dollars, and of fellowships, 5797, amounting to more than two million and a half. Part II deals with state scholarships (35 pages); Part III with scholarships and fellowships available at state supported higher education institutions, the tables showing by institutions the number of scholarships and fellowships available at various financial levels and the distribution by subject matter, also the number of scholarships available at state supported teachers colleges and normal schools. Part IV gives similar information for municipally supported higher educational institutions; and Part V scholarships and fellowships available at privately endowed institutions. The information represents conditions for the year 1934-35.

A GUIDE TO VOCATIONS

Index to Vocations, compiled by Willodeen Price and Zelma E. Ticen; New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1936; 106 pp., \$1.25.

This book attempts to supply an unquestioned need: the furnishing of good references for various occupations. If a high school or college student is considering, say, retail selling, law, and engineering, he can turn to the appropriate occupational references and find the names of books and page references which will be helpful to him.

The need for such a book is so obvious that whenever the task is fairly well done the reviewer should approve. In a field of this sort one can not wait until the perfect book arrives, and even if he should, the publications of the next few months would render the book imperfect again.

This particular book is not well named. An index to vocations would ordinarily be like that issued by the Census Department, classifying and identifying vocations themselves. This book, on the other hand, is a bibliography of the common occupations. It devotes ninety pages to something like 1800 occupations, alphabetically arranged. The references are selected from 115 books, which are separately listed at the back of the book. There are also four pages listing short biographies and two pages of book references for counselors. This last list, including perhaps forty books for counselors, is the only portion of the book which is annotated.

Good as the reference list is, it is fair to say that the lack of annotation interferes with its use. There are, for example, 29 references on the lawyer, 19 on the salesman, and 23 on the general farmer. A simple set of symbols might distinguish those appropriate for the junior-high-school age, those for the senior-high-school age, and those for the college and adult level. Moreover, it is probable that 1800 occupations are too many.

A comparable book is the larger "Books about Jobs," compiled by Willard E. Parker and recently issued by the American Library Association and the National Occupational Conference. Parker's book is even more voluminous in its references and also omits to designate the different levels for which the books are intended. Parker provides something like thirty classifications and arranges them alphabetically, but the logic of his main topics is not apparent. If the Census classification is to be abandoned, perhaps the alphabetical arrangement of the "Index to Vocations" is more defensible.

The "Index to Vocations" seems to have left out some important references, particularly single books on specific callings, but on the whole the preparation of the list has been carefully done.

JOHN M. BREWER

NOTES FROM PERIODICALS

Journal of Higher Education

In the January issue an article by Carter Davidson, "A Plan for a College: A Challenge to Administrative Ingenuity," discusses the plan of concentration of work on a single subject for nine weeks as a three-year experiment now in operation at Hiram College. "Viewing Government at Work" by P. S. Jacobsen describes the Colgate plan now in operation for sending selected members of the Junior class to observe the government at work in Washington. An editorial note gives the list of some 35 institutions which have been approved by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development as its first general list of accredited engineering schools.

The leading article in the February issue by Fernandus Payne on "Research in Higher Education, an Indictment of Meaningless and Superficial Research" describes the need for considerable housecleaning which would eliminate pseudo-research. In an editorial comment on a discussion by President L. D. Coffman of academic freedom, it is observed: "In practice Coffman, Lowell, Conant, and Hutchins seem to be largely in agreement. All believe that the scholarly tradition should restrain faculty members. Their differences relate to the method and degree of restraint. The real conflict lies between the social evangelism of the Counts school and the theory that the professor can contribute his greatest service to society by being a scholar and as such a dispassionate authority on social problems.

"The conflict between these two points of view lies near to the center of the problem of academic freedom. Unfortunately, the American Association of University Professors and other groups interested in academic freedom have never taken a clear-cut position concerning it. Indeed, the profession as a whole has no philosophy about academic freedom. The sooner it evolves one the sooner the public may be educated to a reasonable position. Only then can academic freedom be assured."

School and Society

The issue of January 2 devotes 13 pages to a report of the First National Conference on Educational Broadcasting held in Washington, December 10 to 12, including the address of Secretary Ickes. Over 700 persons were registered at the conference and 150 speakers participated in the various sessions and conferences. Professor A. N. Holcombe of the Council of the Association made the principal address at one of

the general sessions on "Radio Broadcasting as a New Voice in American Politics." The proceedings are to be published by the University of Chicago press.

The leading article in the issue of January 23 by President H. Y. Benedict of the University of Texas on "Desirability and Place of Cooperation in American Higher Education" is quoted in a later *Bulletin*. A radio address by President George Norlin of the University of Colorado entitled "Is Radicalism Rampant on the American Campus?" here published observes that "our schools are neither radical nor reactionary. They occupy a middle ground between two extremes. . . . They are forward-looking institutions; they are, at the same time, conserving institutions. . . . I do not know nor have I heard of a single teacher in an American college or university who is openly or covertly propagandizing for Communism. I mean Communism in the proper sense of that term. Plenty of us are *called* Communists, which is another matter. . . . If it is Communism to strive to preserve and promote the true American tradition against its enemies at either wild extreme, then most of us are Communists. . . . It is high time that the American people learn the truth about their institutions of learning and come to their aid against partisan or selfish interests which would shape them to their own ends. They should come to their defense and enable them to stand unshaken by the wild winds of doctrine that blow, now from this quarter, now from that. They should see to it above all that they remain fortresses of truth in a world of ballyhoo.

"By day and by night we are literally under siege by propaganda—paid propaganda, half-truth propaganda, lying propaganda, powerful propaganda, which modern invention has weaponed with a million tongues. In the midst of this confusion, this bedlam of misrepresentation and misinformation, where is truth to find a refuge, and where may our people look for truth?

"Most of the powerful agencies which determine popular taste and public opinion—newspapers, publishers, the theater, the movies, the radio, and the organized peddlers of economic and political nostrums—are either partisan agencies with axes to grind or commercial agencies which put profits first and the public welfare second, if anywhere.

"The schools, the colleges, and universities—these are the great agencies which society has set up for the welfare of our youth and of our nation. They are peculiar in that they seek their dividends in the public welfare alone; and they can be trusted, I am sure, to keep an eye single to their business of guarding and promoting and disseminating truth."

The article by J. S. Perkins, "Extent and Nature of the Federal WPA Educational Program," calls attention to the fact that the WPA enrol-

ment is 16% larger than the college enrolment for the United States as a whole, though less in certain areas. The writer discusses types of instruction offered and relative extent and influence of the WPA enrolment. "In recent months, according to WPA authorities, several thousand teachers have left Works Progress Administration rolls for positions in established educational institutions. At the same time, the popularity of WPA classes, as measured by enrolment, continues to mount. If this trend should continue, federal officials will shortly be faced with a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, the program will no longer be justified on the grounds of providing jobs for unemployed teachers. On the other hand, however, it will become increasingly difficult to curtail the program in the face of growing demand. The outcome appears likely to be a permanent federal subsidized system of adult education designed primarily to reach underprivileged individuals."

Journal of Engineering Education

In the issue for December President H. P. Hammond of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education publishes his letter in reply to President Roosevelt's open letter of last fall, in which is raised the question concerning the adaptation of engineering schools to the most adequate training for demands in the immediate and distant future. G. M. Butler, discussing the problem, "Should Engineering Curricula Be Lengthened?," makes an interesting plea for a five-year program.

Journal of Adult Education

In the January issue is published a thoughtful and illuminating article by Hans Kohn entitled "Adult Education Needs Scholarship," from which extracts will be quoted in a future issue of the *Bulletin*. Other suggestive articles include that by A. Caswell Ellis on "Research for Urban Universities." It is announced editorially that a plan for a five-year study of adult education is to be undertaken by the Association. "After a decade of experimentation, during which there has been an unprecedented growth in adult education, both the Association and the Carnegie Corporation deem it advisable to pause in order to examine accomplishments and trends and possibly to chart a new course for the future. During the years 1936-41, therefore, the funds granted by the Corporation to the Association for experimental purposes will gradually be diminished, and research and study will be directed less toward opening new fields of adult education activity and more toward the improvement of existing fields. . . ."

School Life

In the January issue J. H. McNeely, Specialist in Higher Education, reviews state university branch systems, referring first to states in which some sort of actual consolidation or affiliation of the institutions is effected by which they become integral parts of the state university. This is the case in Georgia, Montana, and North Carolina. In a number of other states the plan has been adopted on a partial basis, as in California, Missouri, Texas, and Virginia. The branches of the state universities in Missouri and Texas are schools of mines and metallurgy. The branch of the state university in Virginia is a proposed women's college which has not yet been established, but must be located at a point more than thirty miles from the university. A brief account of junior college branches follows.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

APRIL REGIONAL MEETING, CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA

A regional meeting of the Association is being planned at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, at the time of the spring meeting of the American Chemical Society, April 12-15. Among the speakers will be professor W. T. Laprade, of Duke University, Chairman of Committee A; Professor J. B. Bullitt, of the University of North Carolina, member of the Council; and Professor J. Samuel Guy, of Emory University, member of Committee E.

An announcement of the program will be sent to all nearby chapters.

CHAPTER ACTIVITIES

Colgate University. At a dinner meeting last fall, the speaker was Dr. Norbert Wiener of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who discussed experiences in academic life in various parts of the world, with special consideration of Japanese and Chinese universities. A committee of the Chapter is working on the problem of the organization of departments.

DePauw University. At the first dinner meeting of the year, the new President of the University, Dr. Clyde E. Wildman, was the guest speaker. The Chapter has voted to continue a study of the teaching load of the faculty.

Grinnell College. The third monthly meeting of the year held in December was designed especially to interest prospective members. A discussion was led by the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, and others of the administrative staff, on the question "Why Students Voluntarily Leave Grinnell before Graduation."

Monmouth College. The Chapter is holding regular dinner meetings on the last Saturday of each month throughout the academic year. The attendance is reported as excellent and the discussions valuable. At the first meeting of the current year, the new President of the College, Dr. James H. Grier, was the guest of the Chapter. On this occasion the following topics were presented for discussion: (1) Should a faculty member sit with the trustee board? (2) The revision of recruiting policies and entrance requirements; (3) Contracts and tenure.

Mt. Union College. Through the efforts of the local Chapter, an annuity system in the Carnegie Corporation has been established. Although the cost is equally divided between the faculty members and the College itself, the Board of Trustees has granted a general $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent increase in salaries to all members participating in the annuity, thus assuming the entire cost.

University of Nebraska. At the December meeting, the October and November reports of Committee Y were the subject of discussion. Chancellor E. A. Burnett of the University was the guest of honor and spoke at some length. A partial restoration of salaries has now been effected.

University of New Hampshire. The activities planned for the present year include regular dinner meetings with one of the Trustees as guest on each of these occasions. The program includes also regular discussions of methods of teaching, trends in higher education, and similar subjects "which will make the Chapter members a well informed group, capable of molding opinion on teaching and institutional problems." Other subjects of investigation by committees will be salaries, living costs, annuities and pensions, and sabbatical leaves.

Northwestern University. At the meeting on November 30, Professor W. W. Cook reported on the fall Council meeting, and Professors W. B. Evans and J. W. Bell discussed the work of the Survey Committee of the University.

Purdue University. At a dinner meeting last fall the program included prepared discussion of the following subjects: Why tests? self-learning tests; machine grading; and multiple choice tests. All members of the faculty were invited to this meeting.

University of Texas. The dinner meetings of last year were so well attended and successful that the same plan is being followed this year. The Chapter Committee is working on the problem of hospitalization services for the faculty. A systematic campaign for enlarged membership is being carried on.

University of Vermont. The Chapter is continuing this year to hold regular luncheon meetings every month. At the meeting in December, President Dixon Ryan Fox of Union College spoke on "Graduate Study in the Small College." The attendance at these meetings averages about 40 out of the total membership of 50.

College of William and Mary. Regular monthly meetings are held by the Chapter throughout the academic year. At the December meeting Dr. Oscar M. Voorhees, Historian of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, and Professor W. A. Montgomery of the University of Virginia were guests. The program included a talk by Dr. George J. Ryan on "The Forgotten Man of Ancient Rome."

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY, RESTORATION TO ELIGIBLE LIST

The following correspondence between the General Secretary of the Association and the President of DePauw University is self-explanatory:

January 5, 1937

Dear Dr. Wildman:

I am happy to advise you that, by unanimous vote of the Annual Meeting on December 29 following a unanimous vote of the Council on December 27, DePauw University was restored to the eligible list of the American Association of University Professors. This action was taken upon the recommendation of the Chairman of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The Annual Report for 1936 of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure contains the following statement concerning DePauw University:

"General tenure conditions at DePauw University have improved. Moreover, there has been a change of administration. The new president has long been an Active member of the Association, and the members of Committee A have every reason to believe that in the immediate future the principles of academic freedom and tenure for which this Association stands will be observed at DePauw University. I recommend that action be taken at this annual meeting to restore DePauw University to the eligible list."

I am sending notice of this Association's action with reference to DePauw University to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

With kind regards, I am

Very cordially yours,

(S) RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

January 7, 1937

My dear Dr. Himstead:

Your letter of January fifth relative to the action of the American Association of University Professors taken at the annual meeting on December twenty-ninth is at hand. Let me express to you and through you to the Association the very great appreciation of DePauw University of the action which restored DePauw to the eligible list of the American Association of University Professors. DePauw University does not want to be upon any ineligible list in any great association of universities and colleges or in any association of university professors in America.

The University greatly appreciates the action taken by the Council and by the annual meeting of the Association, and I am sure that so far

as I am personally concerned, I shall do everything to merit the confidence which is placed in the administration at DePauw by your action. I appreciate also the notice with reference to DePauw University which you sent to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Faculty morale at DePauw University seems to be very good.

I hope that sometime in the not too distant future you may be able to visit the DePauw University campus to meet the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

Nothing would please me personally more than to have you represent the American Association of University Professors at my inauguration on March tenth as the official delegate. I certainly hope that you may plan to do so.

You may count upon my administration as being sympathetic with the ideals of the American Association of University Professors and you may be sure that every attempt will be made at DePauw to make the ideals real.

Thanking you again for this action and with most cordial greetings, I am

Sincerely yours,

(S) CLYDE E. WILDMAN

OBERLIN COLLEGE, REPORT OF PRESIDENT

An interesting paragraph from the annual report of President Wilkins records partial salary restorations for the faculty.

In summarizing the study of the independent college made under Dr. Wilkins' direction, the report states: "The growth of the junior college has been the most startling development in the field of higher education in the last two decades. . . . At the same time, professional schools are more and more commonly taking students after two years of college work. This situation is obviously menacing for the independent college. . . .

"Reorganization is also taking place in the college field. Its two main forms, often combined, are horizontal division and vertical division.

"Horizontal division means the formal discrimination of the freshman and sophomore years as constituting a first unit, and the junior and senior years as constituting a second unit. It is a formal recognition of the fact that in virtually all colleges now the work of the last two years is essentially different from that of the first two years. . . .

"About 150 collegiate institutions of various types have adopted the plan of horizontal division. The degree of thorough-goingness of the divisional organization differs greatly in different institutions. In some cases the divisional organization is not much more than nominal; in other cases, it is made fully effective through the appointment of separate administrative committees or officers. . . .

"About 125 collegiate institutions have adopted the plan of vertical division....

"There is no disposition whatsoever in Oberlin to seek the status of a full university by the establishment of professional schools other than the Graduate School of Theology, or to carry the graduate work of the College of Arts and Sciences up to the doctorate.... Yet it seemed to practically the entire faculty that we should move, though cautiously, in the upward direction. It was accordingly voted that we should place more emphasis than at present on M.A. work.... Approval was also given to the idea of establishing one or more special Institutes on the graduate level.... The two types of Institutes named in illustration of this idea were first, an Institute of Oriental Studies, and second, an Institute of Peace Studies."

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, REPORT OF PRESIDENT

From the report of President Aydelotte for 1936 is quoted the following: "It is true, that many students, however carefully they make their selections, find it impossible to fit into their program many subjects which they would like to study and they must therefore leave college with quite legitimate and praiseworthy intellectual curiosity, in this direction and that, unsatisfied. From one point of view this is a matter of regret; from another it is probably a healthy state of affairs. If a student leaves college or graduate school with a keen and as yet unsatisfied curiosity about many subjects, he is more likely to use such leisure as his work allows for thoughtful reading, in short, to continue his education throughout his life, always provided he has been able to develop his capacity for independent intellectual work and has formed the habit of doing things for himself. If, on the other hand, he has never acquired the courage to tackle a new subject except when holding fast to the hand of a teacher, if his college course has consisted of a vast accumulation of smatterings of knowledge, there is danger that his keenness and curiosity will be blunted, and that he will settle down in life content with only a superficial imitation of an education....

"The amount of knowledge which a student can accumulate in his college years is limited in any case, and to us at Swarthmore it seems clear that the most useful thing the college can do for him is to train his mind and develop his power of thought, to the end that he will go on through life acquiring as thorough a mastery of subjects in which he is interested as his abilities and opportunities make possible.

"The student who dips into many different subjects will necessarily take a large number of elementary courses. In the nature of things elementary courses are more useful for acquiring information than for developing power of thought. A certain store of ideas is needed before the student can think to good purpose in any field, and consequently it seems clear that the individual who limits his range, who goes on to do advanced work in a few subjects, whose studies are focused and unified, will graduate with a mind more soundly trained, even though the range of his information is not so wide.

"Outside this solid core of academic work our effort is to stimulate the student's interests as widely as possible. To that end extracurricular activities have come during recent years to play a greater and greater part. There are flourishing groups for the study and practice of the various creative arts: music, drawing and painting, dramatics, wood and metal work, public speaking, and creative writing—all conducted by members of the Faculty on a voluntary and extracurricular basis, with enjoyment as one of the ends no less than proficiency.

"True education is the result of the contagion of thought and enthusiasm quite as much as of the formal machinery of courses and examinations. It demands a concentration of teachers and students of high ability and varied experience, who are withal fine human beings, sensitive to interests which rise above the merely personal and utilitarian. Its enemies are pedantry on the one hand and sentimentality on the other. The true spirit of an educational institution is robust and sincere, courageous to face reality, interested in facts and still more in meaning. It is healthy, it loves sport and the zest of hard work. It can not breathe where there is not freedom of thought and discussion. It will not appear in a place where teachers are merely repeating what they, in turn, have learned from their teachers or from books, and where a student's work is dull drudgery, performed because it is required of him, unilluminated by any spark of imagination or curiosity or any sense of growing power. The university spirit is the result of free play of creative intelligence, and is most readily caught from men who are engaged in the glorious adventure of pushing back the boundaries of human knowledge and adding to the triumphs of the human spirit."

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, FACULTY-STUDENT COMMITTEE

The recently announced policy in relation to student organizations formed for dealing with social, political, and economic issues includes the following statements:

"Temple University adheres to the principle of freedom of discussion on all subjects within law, by students and faculty. To the end that this principle may be realized in practice there shall be established a Faculty-

Student Committee on Public Affairs Organizations, the organization, powers, and duties of which are herewith outlined together with certain general principles for guiding the work of this body."

Following provisions defining the organization, powers, and duties of this committee is the formulation of "general principles" governing its deliberations. Among these are included the provision of adequate meeting places; the right of any local student groups to affiliate with national bodies having similar aims; the privilege of inviting speakers if the committee is informed in advance of the invitation; and publication of notice of all meetings in the *Temple University News*.

"The administration of Temple University reserves the sole right to express the University's opinion on any or all social, political, or economic questions. At no time shall any group act as though it were representing the University. As a safeguard against misunderstanding, the opening paragraph of any resolutions adopted by such groups and descriptions of the meetings shall carefully indicate the name of the organization, the number attending, and the number voting for and against such resolutions."

It is further specified that "sincere efforts shall be made by each of the groups under discussion to safeguard publicity, with especial care being taken that press releases shall specify exactly the group involved."

YALE UNIVERSITY, REPORT OF PRESIDENT

The following extracts are from the annual report of President Angell:

"Periodically we have a clamor for an entirely new start in collegiate or university education, and in the last fifty years a number of more or less novel and highly important ventures have thus been launched. Each began by preaching a new educational gospel; each has made unquestioned contributions to American education. But each has gradually taken on the typical contours of the normal American university pattern. This circumstance suggests that however important may be the reform movements at the university level—and many of them have been of undoubted value—there is something very deep and enduring in the national pattern of education which yields reluctantly to merely bright ideas when these touch the underlying foundations on which institutions rest. Almost any experienced scholar could propose changes in our procedure which, if one were free to start anew, would promise much better results than we now achieve; but, unless such changes have their roots well down in national and institutional history, they are not likely to exercise any considerable and enduring influence. Like the English universities, their American descendants have always been under critical fire for lack of clear-cut purpose and sense of direction

and often for alleged insensitiveness to changes in the intellectual and social climate to which it is felt they should respond. . . .

"That the nation has an explicit and important stake in the further education of the unemployed, especially the youthful members of such a group, has become quite clear. That adult education of various kinds forms at once an obligation and an opportunity for community betterment has become much more generally accepted than before. That abundant opportunity for wholesome recreation is socially essential has established itself more firmly in public conviction. That the community also has a stake in the maintenance of opportunity for those possessing talents and training in the arts has gained appreciable recognition.

"The methods adopted to put in execution these and other similar principles may have been defective and open to just criticism, but the wide acceptance of them represents an important step forward in the life of our democracy which will hardly be retraced. It reflects at once a public recognition of the possibility of profitable education beyond the point normally reached by the average citizen and the further realization that when financial catastrophe comes down on large numbers of our people, through no fault of their own, educational activities for which the community accepts responsibility may represent invaluable means for alleviating an instant collapse of morale and for the building up of knowledge, skills, and discipline which can be turned to real account when economic equilibrium is again restored. . . .

"To be compelled to weigh dispassionately and relentlessly every phase of procedure—as this crisis has forced almost every institution to do—in order to discover the points where drastic economies and retrenchment can best be made is a painful experience, but it may ultimately be a wholesome one. This we of the endowed institutions have been obliged to do, some less thoroughly than others, but all to a very definite degree.

"It has forced us to draw lines of distinction regarding the relative importance of phases of our activities which in times of prosperity become blurred and forgotten. While we would display a becoming gratitude for these unpalatable blessings of adversity, there is no one of us who will not welcome a return to times less strenuous when we can measure plans and programs less by the financial yardstick and more by standards of spiritual and intellectual advancement. Certainly I trust that this is the last time for many years to come when the Report of the President of Yale will of necessity make such frequent reference to fiscal matters."

MEMBERSHIP

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and twenty-eight Active and forty-six Junior members as follows:

ACTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED

Alfred University, Harold C. Harrison; **Bethany College (West Virginia)**, John S. V. Allen, Chandler Shaw, Wilbur Sumpstine; **University of California at Los Angeles**, Francis E. Blacet, Robert M. Glendinning, William G. Young; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Raymond A. Fisher; **Case School of Applied Science**, Richard S. Burington; **The City College (New York)**, Lester Thonssen; **Clarkson School of Technology**, Charles Hecker; **Colorado State College**, George M. McEwen; **Denison University**, Helen Badenoch, Sue Haurly, Ellenor Shannon, Henry J. Skipp; **Findlay College**, Raymond M. Gonso; **Fordham University Graduate School**, Jeremiah F. T. O'Sullivan; **George Washington University**, Carville D. Benson, Jr., Ralph D. Kennedy, Donald Kline, John F. Latimer; **Henderson State Teachers College**, Robert T. Proctor, William Ritchie; **Howard College**, James L. Brakefield; **Illinois State Normal University**, Margaret Cooper, Harry O. Lathrop, George M. Palmer, Agnes Rice; **Illinois State Teachers College (Western)**, Clyde Beighey, Robert M. Ginnings, Ernest G. Hildner, Jr., Blenda L. Olson, Leon A. Pennington, William L. Schuppert, Henry I. Stubblefield, Arthur G. Tillman, H. D. Waggoner, Hilda M. Watters; **Iowa State College**, Albert L. Walker; **James Millikin University**, Raymond R. Brewer, Frederick C. Hottes, Albert T. Mills, R. Ronald Palmer; **Johns Hopkins University**, Lowell J. Reed; **Kansas State College**, Harry M. Stewart; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Minnie M. Miller, Della A. Warden; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Claude Leist; **University of Kentucky**, Martin M. White; **Louisiana State Normal College**, Minnie L. Odom, Germaine Portre-Bobinski; **Louisiana State University**, Paul M. Spurlin; **McKendree College**, Charles J. Stowell; **University of Missouri**, D. Bailey Calvin; **Mount Holyoke College**, Ethel B. Dietrich; **New Mexico State College**, Percy M. Baldwin, John H. Butler, Percy Cockerill, Albert Curry, Walter P. Heinzman, Clarence Hope, Hugh M. Milton, Jr., Margaret O'Laughlin, Melvin A. Thomas, W. Ellis Watkins; **New York State College for Teachers**, Margaret Hayes; **Northwestern University**, Arthur S. Hathaway; **University of Notre Dame**, Ronald C. Cox; **Ohio University**, Margaret Benedict, Ossian C. Bird, Mary D. Blayney, Vera Board, Howard L. Dunlap, Bernard Hughes, Vincent Jukes; **Oklahoma State Teachers College (Northwestern)**, Frank K. Wadley; **University of Oklahoma**, Della I. Brunsteter; **University of Rochester**, Raymond V. Bowers, John Hoffmeister, Jessie Hoskam, Selina Meyer; **Skidmore College**, Evelyn N. Akeley, Dorothy W. Upton; **Smith College**, Kate R. Koch; **University of Southern California**, Thomas Clements; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, Russell J. Cook; **Texas State Teachers College (Southwest)**, C. E. Chamberlin, Verna Deckert, Mable L. Evans, Georgia Lazenby, Alma Lueders, Retta Murphy, Sue Taylor, W. C. Vernon; **University of Texas**, Ruth A. Allen, G. W. Goldsmith, Richard J. Gonzalez, E. E. Hale, Robert H. Montgomery, Clarence A. Wiley; **Tulane University**, Stella M. Leche, Marie D. Mattingly, Wilbur C. Smith; **Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute**, George L. Washington; **Upsala College**, Alfred M. Carlson, Karl T. Schwing; **University of Utah**, Edwin Clapp; **State College of Washington**, Ida L. Anderson, Norma Anderson, George Baughman, William R. Bond, Harry M. Chambers, Ike Deeter, Edwin F. Dummeier, Emma Glebe, Edward Hawkins, Paul

H. Landis, Harald H. Logan, Adolph J. Roth, Hugh C. Vincent, Harold P. Wheeler; **Wheaton College**, Elizabeth C. Evans; **College of William and Mary**, James W. Miller, George M. Small, Charles H. Stone; **University of Wisconsin**, W. Freeman Twaddell; **Yale University**, Oystein Orr.

TRANSFERS FROM JUNIOR TO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

University of Akron, James V. Rice; **University of Cincinnati**, Henry G. Hodges; **Connecticut College**, Marjorie R. Dilley; **Dartmouth College**, Joseph S. Tidd; **University of Florida**, Manning J. Dauer; **George Washington University**, John B. White-law; **Iowa State College**, Charles H. Norby; **Lafayette College**, J. G. Bagster-Collins; **Limestone College**, Margaret M. Wood; **Louisiana State University**, Thomas A. Kirby, Robert W. Virtue; **Mercer University**, William E. Fort, Jr.; **New York University**, Irving S. Lowen; **Oklahoma State Teachers College (Southeastern)**, Eugene E. Slaughter; **Pennsylvania State College**, Nora E. Wittman; **University of Rochester**, Robert A. Pratt; **Seton Hill College**, James A. Llorens; **Simmons College**, Horace B. Davis; **Smith College**, Charles B. Hagan.

JUNIOR MEMBERS ELECTED

Alfred University, Daniel P. Eginton; **Allegheny College**, Curtis D. Rudolf; **American University**, Donald C. Weeks; **Bethany College (West Virginia)**, Helen Hosp; **Boston University**, John M. Pratt; **Colgate University**, Edward C. Starr; **Denison University**, Freeman Miller; **University of Florida**, J. Wayne Reitz; **George Washington University**, Lawrence L. Jarvie, Walter B. Kunz; **Hamline University**, Joseph W. Broyles, Donald E. Swanson; **Hood College**, Catherine Gross; **Illinois State Teachers College (Western)**, James C. Snapp; **Indiana University**, Mary M. Crawford; **University of Louisville**, Richard Krautheimer; **New Mexico State College**, Marion Payzant, Roberta Sainsbury, Tyrus Timm, Charles M. Wolfe; **University of New Mexico**, Patrick Miller; **Ohio University**, Arthur J. Bronstein, Lawrence P. Eblin; **Pennsylvania State College**, Aaron Druckman, Bruce Sutherland; **University of Rochester**, Edgar Cumings, George B. Raser; **St. Louis University**, James K. Neill, Edmund J. Radzuk; **Syracuse University**, Howard M. Kline; **Temple University**, Raymond Hendrickson; **Texas State Teachers College (Southwest)**, Syrrrel S. Wilks; **Tulane University**, Margaret Groben; **State College of Washington**, Viola M. Beery, Mildred Boggs, Lincoln Constance, Thomas L. Hansen, W. R. Moses, Raymon Smeltz, Clyfford E. Still, H. Ashley Weeks; **College of William and Mary**, Roy P. Ash, Richard H. Henneman, Lionel H. Laing; **Not in University Connection**, Pearl H. Weber (M.A., Chicago), Omaha, Nebr.; Edward S. A. Altieri (B.B.A., Boston), Providence, R. I.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and sixty-two nominations for Active membership and twenty nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before April 25, 1937.

The primary purpose of this provision is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of nominees under the provision of the Constitution affecting membership, namely: "Active members. Any university or college teacher or investigator who holds, and for three years has held, a position of teaching or research in a university or college (not including independent junior colleges) in the United States or Canada, or in a professional school of similar grade, may be nominated for membership in the Association. At the discretion of the Committee on Admissions service in foreign institutions may also be counted toward the three-year requirement." "Junior members shall be graduate students or persons eligible for nomination as Active members except in length of service."

The Committee on Admissions consists of Ella Lonn, Goucher, Chairman; H. L. Crosby, Pennsylvania; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette; A. Richards, Oklahoma; W. O. Sypherd, Delaware; F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State.

ACTIVE NOMINATIONS

Harold Abbott (Chemistry), Pennsylvania College for Women
A. G. Alexander (English), Louisiana State Normal
Alma J. Anderson (Fine Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
George K. Anderson (English), Brown
Elsie Andrews (Library), Michigan State Normal
Carl H. Appell (Physical Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Amy E. Armstrong (English), Minnesota
Mary L. Austin (Zoology), Wellesley
John L. Ballif, Jr. (French), Utah
Herbert Behm (English), Minnesota
Harry S. Bernton (Hygiene), Georgetown
Ellett M. deBerry (Mental Hygiene), Minnesota
Bonnie R. Blackburn (Modern Languages), James Millikin
Louise Blymer (English), Berea
Merl E. Bonney (Educational Psychology), Texas State Teachers (North)
Arthur P. Bourier (English), Minnesota

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

- Charles E. Braun (Organic Chemistry), Vermont
Mary C. Brogdon (English), Texas State Teachers (Southwest)
Henry B. Bull (Physiological Chemistry), Northwestern
George Burr (Plant Physiology), Minnesota
Alistair Cameron (Greek), Bryn Mawr
Adelaide L. Campbell (Music), Hollins
Gus W. Campbell (Speech, English), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Harry B. Center (Journalism), Boston
Eleanor G. Clark (English), Hunter
Marion Cleaveland (Chemistry), Western Reserve
Lillian Cobb (French), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Beryl D. Cohon (Religion), Boston
Carl Colditz (German), Wayne
James W. Coleman (Physical Education), Nevada
William J. Cope (Mechanical Engineering), Utah
Walter P. Cottam (Botany), Utah
Carl C. Cramer (Industrial Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Raymond F. Crawford (Biology), New Mexico State
Wilma DeLassus (Home Economics), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Boyd C. Dennison (Electrical Engineering), Carnegie Institute of Technology
Frances Diebold (Biology), Kalamazoo
John R. DuPriest (Mechanical Engineering), Minnesota
Edward F. Edel (Industrial Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Oliver C. Edwards (Engineering, Mathematics), Minnesota
Ruth Elliott (Hygiene, Physical Education), Wellesley
Fred J. Evans (Engineering), Carnegie Institute of Technology
John R. Eyer (Biology), New Mexico State
Kady B. Faulkner (Art), Nebraska
Walter R. Fee (History), Michigan State
Con Fenning (Pharmacology, Physiology), Utah
G. F. Ferris (Entomology), Stanford
Oliver R. Floyd (Education), Minnesota
Charles E. Fouser (Music), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
C. Luther Fry (Sociology), Rochester
Brewster Ghiselin (English), Utah
Paul M. Giesy (English, Chemistry), Newark College of Engineering
James K. Greer (History), Howard (Alabama)
Elijah L. Grover (Education), Michigan State
Lawrence R. Guild (Management Engineering), Carnegie Institute of Technology
Homer Hall (Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Alvin H. Hansen (Economics), Minnesota
Paul E. Harrison (Industrial Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Helene W. Hartley (Education), Syracuse
Hope Haupt (Art), Louisiana State Normal
Edna Heidbreder (Psychology), Wellesley
L. Burton Hessler (English), Minnesota
Edward L. Hill (Physics), Minnesota
John W. Hobe (Industrial Management), Carnegie Institute of Technology
H. D. Hopkins (Speech), Heidelberg
George Howerton (Music), Hiram

Ira J. Jenks (Chemistry), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Adolph L. Jensen (Law), Utah
Donald W. Johnson (Animal Husbandry), Minnesota
Hjalmar W. Johnson (Philosophy), Augustana
Palmer O. Johnson (Education), Minnesota
Willis H. Johnson (Biology), Stanford
Frank R. Kille (Zoology), Swarthmore
Annie E. King (Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Corliss R. Kinney (Chemistry), Utah
John C. Kohl (Civil Engineering), Carnegie Institute of Technology
Richard L. Kozelka (Statistics), Minnesota
Andrew J. Kozora (Mathematics, Physics), Duquesne
William M. Laux (History), Wisconsin State Teachers (LaCrosse)
Helen H. Law (Greek), Wellesley
Julian G. Leach (Plant Pathology, Botany), Minnesota
Mabel M. Leidy (Commercial Education), Temple
Theodor LeVander (Speech), Augustana
Sarah L. Lewis (Home Economics), Nevada
William Lindsay (Music), Minnesota
Howard P. Longstaff (Psychology), Minnesota
Henry L. McClintock (Law), Minnesota
Gladys K. McCosh (Zoology), Wellesley
James G. McGivern (Mechanical Engineering), State College of Washington
Eva McKee (Physical Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
James B. McMillan (English), Alabama
Irvine McQuarrie (Pediatrics), Minnesota
Ray E. Marsell (Geology, Geography), Utah
Florence Maryott (English), Nebraska
L. Eveline Merritt (Fine Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Barnette Miller (History), Wellesley
Wallace B. Moffett (English), Michigan State
Howard B. Monier (Dairy Husbandry), Berea
Charles E. Montgomery (Biology), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Franz Montgomery (English), Minnesota
Grace M. Morton (Home Economics), Nebraska
Celine Neptune (Home Economics), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Herbert T. Norris (Music), State College of Washington
Milo T. Oakland (Industrial Arts), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Orin A. Ogilvie (Bacteriology, Pathology), Utah
Jay L. O'Hara (Economics), Akron
Clare S. Ohlson (Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Upton Palmer (Speech), Missouri State Teachers (Southeast)
Walter H. Parker (Mining), Minnesota
Arthur L. Patterson (Physics), Bryn Mawr
Bena M. Peterson (Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Ralph R. Pickett (Commerce), Kansas State Teachers (Emporia)
Jessie P. Pope (Home Economics), Nevada
Theodore H. Post (Music), Nevada
William L. Prosser (Law), Minnesota
Emerson M. Pugh (Physics), Carnegie Institute of Technology

Estabrook Rankin (English), Michigan State Normal
Waldemar P. Read (Philosophy), Utah
Harold G. Reuschlein (Law), Georgetown
Flavia L. Richardson (Zoology), Vermont
Sarah R. Riedman (Physiology), Brooklyn
Dorothy M. Robathan (Latin), Wellesley
Josephine Ross (Home Economics), Illinois State Normal
Edith Ruebsam (Education), Nevada
Harold W. Ruopp (Preaching), Boston
Helen G. Russell (Mathematics), Wellesley
John C. Russell (Political Science), Syracuse
William T. Ryan (Electrical Engineering), Minnesota
John W. Sattler (English, Speech), Berea
Corinne L. Saucier (Spanish), Louisiana State Normal
William A. Schubert (Biology), Duquesne
John H. Scott (English), Iowa
Chester M. Scranton (Physical Education), Nevada
Ronald B. Shuman (Economics), Oklahoma
Quentin D. Singewald (Geology), Rochester
Louise P. Smith (Biblical History), Wellesley
Margaret E. Smith (Home Economics), Arkansas
Nelson Snyder (Education), Akron
Martin Sommerfeld (German), Smith
Donald Strout (Classics), Hastings
E. Ruth Taylor (English, Journalism), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Philip H. Taylor (Political Science), Syracuse
Thomas A. H. Teeter (Engineering), Minnesota
Lela Trager (Physical Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Mary B. Treudley (Economics, Sociology), Wellesley
Alice F. Tyler (American History), Minnesota
Margaret E. Van Winkle (Zoology), Wellesley
Elbert Voss (Botany), Duquesne
Emilie Wagner (German, French), Pomona
Harriet C. Waterman (Zoology), Wellesley
Edna Weare (Home Economics), Nebraska State Teachers (Peru)
Edgar B. Wesley (Social Studies), Minnesota
Ella K. Whiting (English), Wellesley
Dwight Williams (Government, Business Law), Kansas State
Mary N. Williams (Education), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Vera M. Wiswall (Music), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Charline Wood (English), James Millikin
James G. Woodburn (Hydraulic Engineering), State College of Washington
Ethel M. Woolhiser (Education, Psychology), Illinois State Teachers (Northern)
Paulina D. Wyman (Biology, Chemistry), Western Maryland
Hal C. Yingling (Biology), Augustana
William E. Young (Education), Syracuse

JUNIOR NOMINATIONS

Ollie Backus (Speech), Grinnell
Eleanor R. Bartholomew (Chemistry), Hollins
F. Eleanor Brooks (English), Berea
R. Murray Christian (History), Alabama
James E. Congleton (English), Tulane
Rowland Gray-Smith (Philosophy), Pennsylvania
Louis A. Haselmayer, Jr. (English), Minnesota
Emmett Hazelwood (Mathematics), New Mexico State
Murphy R. Hinson (Education), Florida State for Women
Richard B. Hocking (Philosophy), Minnesota
William C. Kirk (Greek, German), Grove City
Floyd C. Knight (Machine Design), Case
Rodney C. Loehr (History), Minnesota
Horace T. Morse (Education), Minnesota
Philip H. Overmeyer (Modern History), Minnesota
Laurence A. Sensmeier (Economics), Kansas
Walter W. Sikes (Bible), Berea
Elizabeth N. Todhunter (Home Economics), State College of Washington
Una Vermillion (Economics), State College of Washington
Harold E. Wise (Education), Nebraska

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

While the Association has recently voted to suspend its Appointment Service as a measure of economy under seemingly unfavorable conditions, the *Bulletin* is glad to render service to appointing officers and members by continuing the publication of the information below. The officers of the Association can, however, take no responsibility for maintaining a register or for making a selection among applicants. In the case of announcements of vacancies, it is optional with the appointing officer to publish the address in the announcement or to use a key number as heretofore. In the latter case members interested may forward their applications through headquarters. In case of teachers available an address may be included in the announcement or appointing officers may communicate with members through headquarters.

Vacancies Reported

Accounting: Instructor or assistant professor, man, eastern Catholic college, near New York City. Ph.D. preferred, at least two years' teaching experience. Appointment to be made in June or July for position beginning September, 1937. Salary, \$2200-\$2400. V 1080

Economics and Finance: Instructor, man, eastern Catholic college, near New York City. Ph.D. preferred, at least two years' teaching experience. Appointment to be made in June or July for position beginning September, 1937. Salary, \$2000. V 1081

Law: Instructor, man, eastern Catholic college, near New York City. At least two years' teaching experience. Appointment to be made in June or July for position beginning September, 1937. Salary, \$2000. V 1082

Teachers Available

Chemist, Chemical Engineer: Ph.D., 10 years' industrial research, consulting, testing. Ten years' teaching physical, engineering, inorganic, analytical, industrial, microscopy, etc. Employed. Available on short notice. A 1405

Economics: Ph.D. candidate. Teaching and research experience. Publications. A 1406

English: Man, A.M. Harvard, Ph.D. Cornell. Twelve years' experience as college teacher and lecturer; foreign travel; slight publication. Now employed; desires change. A 1407

French, Spanish: American, married; elementary and secondary education in France; A.B. and M.A. in America; studies in French, Spanish and Canadian universities; Ph.D. candidate, Columbia. Fluent in German and Italian; 10 years of university teaching; now in charge of prosperous department. A 1408